H15

THE AUTHENTICITY AND DATE

OF THE

SOPHOCLEAN AJAX

VERSES 1040–1420

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, IN THE FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BY

HARWOOD HOADLEY

3781
C72H

UNCLASSED
Dissertation

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.
1909

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

THE AUTHENTICITY AND DATE

OF THE

SOPHOCLEAN AJAX

VERSES 1040–1420

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University

BY

HARWOOD HOADLEY

STANFORD LIBRARY

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.
1909

153613

STANFORD LIBRARY

TO MY MOTHER.

INTRODUCTION.

From very early times the artistic character of the ending of the Sophoclean Ajax has been severely impugned,[1] and of late years critics such as Otto Ribbeck and chiefly Theodor Bergk[2] have denied the authenticity of the passage vv. 1040–1420. By reviewing carefully the stylistic and metrical features of the lines and the poetical feeling which they embody I shall endeavor first, to establish their non-Sophoclean origin; then to show that they probably date from the last part of the fifth century, and hence are, conjecturally, the work of the much-beladen but *not* third-rate poet Iophon, about 435–425; further that the present ending is not wholly Iophon's, but is a remodelling of the original ending by Sophocles, to suit the more violent political feelings of the times, yet that on one point at least, the attitude of the gods toward the burial of the hero, Iophon kept substantially the point of view and general line of argument of his father. By comparing these arguments with those used in the similar case in the Antigone I shall then try to show that the latter play is from five to ten years subsequent to the original Ajax, the force of the comparison being augmented by the possibility that Sophocles was the first to introduce into post-epic literature the stories of the disputed burial of Ajax and of Antigone's heroism. The date of the Antigone is

[1] Schol. on vss. 1123, 1127, 1205.

[2] Ribbeck, *Sophokles und seine Tragödien* (Vortrag gehalten im Saale der Kieler Harmonie am 16. April, 1868), Berlin, 1869, p. 19; Bergk, *Gr. Litt.-gesch.* (1872–8), 3, 378 ff.; Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks* (ed. 1896), pp. 187–8. See also the lists in Van Leeuwen's *De Aiacis Sophoclei authentia et integritate*, p. 51, n. 2, and p. 75, n. 1. Verses 1028–1039 have been questioned with considerable reason by Morstadt, "*Progr.*, 1863, p. 30 f.," but it is doubtful if we should consider them in connection with our passage.

then fixed at about 440 B. C., partly on internal evidence, chiefly by its connection with the Samian war of that year; and the original ending of the Ajax is thus placed about 450 B. C.

Manifestly this discussion will be attended with very great uncertainties. Through the scarcity of positive evidence one must not expect definitive results but be content with the least unlikely conjecture, which will be based wherever possible on cumulative testimony. Yet I feel quite certain that some such theory as is given below, p. 21, represents in the main the actual history of the Ajax.

ANALYSIS.

PAGE.

INTRODUCTION v

PART I. The Authenticity and Date of the Present Ending.

1. *The authenticity of the passage* 1
   - *a.* The dramatic function of the ending 1
   - *b.* The general tone of the passage 3
   - *c.* Political feeling 4
   - *d.* Diction 5
   - *e.* Metre 6
   - *f.* Conclusion 7

2. *The probable date* 7
   - *a.* Parallel passages 8
   - *b.* Metrical evidence 9
   - *c.* Political spirit 10
   - *d.* Stylistic features 11
   - *e.* Conclusion 12

3. *The possible author* 12

PART II. The Date of the Original Sophoclean Ending.

1. *Relation between the present and the original ending of the Ajax* 15
2. *Sophocles' interest in burial problems* 16
3. *Comparison of the arguments for burial in the Ajax and the Antigone* 18
   - *a.* Legitimacy of the comparison 18
   - *b.* The several arguments 19
   - *c.* Conclusion 20

4. *The date of the Antigone.—General Conclusion* 20
5. *The history of the Ajax* 21

EXCURSUS A. On Iophon's Literary Work and Character 25

Excursus B.	The Originality of the Plot of the Antigone	27
	(The Authenticity of Sept. 1040–1084)	30
Excursus C.	The Originality of the Plot of the Ajax	33
Excursus D.	The Question of Burial Rights in Known Fifth Century Plays other than the Ajax and the Antigone	35
Excursus E.	The Date of the Antigone	38
Bibliography		50
Life		52

THE AUTHENTICITY AND DATE

OF THE

SOPHOCLEAN AJAX

VERSES 1040–1420

The points urged against the authenticity of verses 1040–1420 of the Sophoclean Ajax involve the character of the argumentation, the general tone and spirit of the passage, and its diction, taken in connection with certain of its metrical peculiarities. The argument is not based on any one point, but is rather cumulative.

The least tenable objection is that the controversies between Teucer, Agamemnon, and Menelaus add nothing essential to the play. We must accordingly examine the general economy of the drama. As in the Antigone so here, one of the dominant elements is the characteristically Hellenic belief that "pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall." That Ajax has been guilty of this sin, and because of it has met with the punishment described, is clearly stated in the words both of Athena and of Calchas. But harmoniously with the Aristotelian principle,[1] even though he is culpable in many things, yet in most points his nature is lofty and noble. Not only is the deep affection and loyalty between him and his friends and kin, underneath his gruff and relatively unemotional exterior, one of the chief adornments and charms alike of the man and of the play; but Ajax is also a brave and vigorous warrior, equal to all emergencies alike in council and in battle, second only to

[1] Poetics, 13.

Achilles; never shunning toil or danger on behalf of the Greeks, often the sole savior of the army; withal conspicuous for integrity and dignity. If then the play were to end after his death or after Teucer's lament, we should feel that although he has been deservedly punished, too little emphasis has been laid on his virtues, and *οὐδὲ φοβερὸν οὐδὲ ἐλεεινὸν τοῦτο ἀλλὰ μιαρόν ἐστιν.* In the much-disputed soliloquy 646–692[2] the poet, as I believe, would have us understand that Ajax both recognizes and confesses his sins against the gods and the Atridæ and at the same time yields them in heart his full submission (albeit with hatred toward the chieftains); therefore, to atone for his sins, but chiefly because inward shame and outward disgrace will not suffer him longer to live, he determines to end his existence. Some ending for the play is thus demanded which shall bring out the hero's virtues in strongest relief, and at the same time show him to us vindicated and restored to divine favor, even though in death;[3] and it also seems to be forecast in the preceding part of the drama, particularly in verses 572–3 and 826–30 (add 227–30, 245–56, 721–32). But this is just what we have in the discussion between the Atridæ, and Teucer and Odysseus. As to details we need only note among other things, that quite consistently, no reply is made to the charge of pride, insubordination, and self-will, other than the contention of Odysseus (itself in line with the general thought of Teucer) that the hero's virtues far outweigh his faults,—an entirely adequate rejoinder for the purposes of the tragedy. A similar notion underlies the argu-

[2] Sophoclean lines are numbered by the text of Jebb, 1897; Æschylean by that of Sidgwick, 1902; Euripidean by that of Nauck, 1891–5; tragic fragments by the edition of Nauck, 1889.

[3] See L. Campbell, *Tragic Drama in Æschylus, Sophocles, and Shakespeare,* pp. 160 and 163. This principle appears at first sight not to be observed in many tragedies (notably the O. T.); yet I believe that it can in substance be maintained for all those plays where the hero suffers,—certainly for the Ajax.

ment that the gods demand Ajax's burial, the point of view apparently being that if he was noble and worthy, it is contrary to the divine will to do him outrage.

More serious is the charge that these arguments are marred by bluster, threats, and abuse, and lack the dignity and lofty tone of the preceding part, and in large measure the subtle portrayal of individuality which is so characteristic of Sophocles. The same thing can of course be said of a very large number of speeches and discussions in Greek literature: witness Demosthenes' oration on the Crown, or possibly, the acrimony seen in the Sophoclean Electra, in the Antigone (*e. g.,* 726–765), and in the Coloneus. On the other hand it might be urged that these elements do not appear in our passage except in reply to the tyrannous injustice and personal hatred of the Atridæ and to the bold defiance of Teucer, while at the same time they are offset by sundry fine details. It is Agamemnon who sums up most happily one of the fundamental thoughts of the tragedy, that sound-mindedness always surpasses mere physical prowess (1250–2). The commonplaces on good government, though strongly tinged with tyrannism, it can not have been the writer's intention to present to the Athenians in a wholly bad light.[4] Nor is it easy to surpass in tactfulness and magnanimity Odysseus' defence of Ajax, or the courtly dialogue between him and Teucer;[5] the closing anapests also present a very effective scene. We must also remember that the situation at the end of the play is far different from what it is at the beginning. So long as Ajax is alone with his own people, the wonderful Sophoclean "Seelenmalerei" with its play and interplay of emotion,—pity, affection, anguish, despair, submission,—and its portrayal and development of character,—dignity and integrity, true piety though modified by pride and high self-

[4] See 1091 and the Scholiast.

[5] Indeed as Bernhardy says (*Gr. Litt.,* 1877–92, 2. 2. 366), the rôle of Odysseus "verräth keinen mittelmässigen Kopf."

confidence, devotion and care for his own, tenderness and love carefully concealed under a rough exterior,—all these have fullest opportunity for manifesting themselves. But when strong and violent enemies thrust themselves in, another task awaits the poet,—to defend the hero *with vigor:* it is a time of storm and conflict (1163), and nobility, loyalty, and love must now find different expression. Hence the sharpness and violence of the conflict;[6] hence defence wherever defence can be made; hence possibly the lack of that peculiar depth and sublimity which so strongly marks the former parts (—note that the situation presents to us no lofty abstract conception such as runs through the Antigone: the problem in the Ajax is immensely concrete). Now this is undeniable, and it must also be admitted with Van Leeuwen (p. 114) that our feeling on these matters is far different from that of the Athenians of the fifth and fourth centuries. At the same time it cannot be denied, first, that the comparative lack of deep feeling, fundamental dignity, and fine psychology has not been adequately explained; second, that the speeches of Teucer and especially of Agamemnon are marred by abusive and insulting language and virulence of animosity which are not only superfluous,[7] but in the special form and use which they have here, are impossible to parallel in any extant work of Sophocles, and seem to be entirely out of keeping with his art and method as we understand it.

Closely akin to this feature of the passage is the bitterness of the contrast between Spartan and Athenian, which also is held to be inconsistent with the method and spirit of Soph-

[6] The traditional criticism, "wearisome and frosty," seems very strange: the passage is certainly well calculated to hold an audience; see Jebb, *Ajax*, ed. 1896 (xliv–)xlv, n. 1. See below, p. 13, n. 34.

[7] Van Leeuwen's attempt (*op. cit.*, p. 58) to justify this part of the play by connecting it with the Arm. Iud. of Æschylus, while it shows the probable general relationship between the two works, is valueless as to details. Ajax's abuse of Odysseus in the Arm. Iud., fr. 175 = Ai. 190; cf. fr. 177 = Ai. 475, 477–8.

ocles as we know him. But as shown above (p. 2), the main part of the play at once forecasts and necessitates some such conflict, and the form of the myth adopted by Sophocles prescribes a Spartan (or Peloponnesian) and an Athenian (or Salaminian) as the contestants. On the other hand it is undeniable that the spirit of violent international animosity seems to be alien to the manner of Sophocles; the closest parallel is in the conflict between Theseus and Creon in the Coloneus, a play which in its final form belongs to the last days of the poet's life, at which time (as the Philoctetes witnesses) he was strongly under "Euripidean" influence: whence the end of the Ajax has with some reason been assigned to a "Euripidean" writer. Yet it is quite possible that the more flagrant anti-Spartan sentiments may be due to actors or editors; in fact, to them might conceivably be attributed Teucer's first speech from about v. 1100 on, most or all of Agamemnon's (1226–63), and parts of Teucer's last (1290 ff.; 1386–92), all the rest being Sophoclean. But this is really anticipating, and we must suspend judgment in this matter.

An examination of the diction of the passage shows, in a way, negative results. A classification of all the words (except conjunctions, pronouns, the commoner adverbs, etc.) and word usages occurring in the trimeters and anapests of this section, under the heads (1) exclusively poetic, (2) poetic with a prose usage as well, (3) neutral, gives only 65 of the first class (*e. g.*, μυθήσει 1041, κραίνει 1050, ἄφερπε 1161, φλέγοντος 1278, τελεσφόρος 1390) and about 90 of the next (*e. g.*, ἀρούρας 1286, εὐγενεῖς 1095) as against some 370 of the third (*e. g.*, κακοῦργος 1043, μαθεῖν 1046). (I have found none that could safely be called decidedly prosaic.)[8]

[8] Some thirty words or usages of rare occurrence in extant literature are impossible to classify with certainty as poetic or prosaic: (*a*) *words rare in poetry*, as βάνασον 1121; (*b*) *usages rare in poetry*, as κοσμῆσαι 1103, διαρρεῖ 1267; (*c*) *usages not elsewhere in poetry*, as

A study of the phrasing and syntax shows much the same thing. There are few or no instances of striking metaphorical usages and phrases (*e. g.*, *πεῖραν ἔσβεσεν* 1057, *ἡ γλῶσσα τὸν θυμὸν τρέφει* 1124, *ἐν τροπῇ δορός* 1275). So, too, of syntactical forms (*e. g.*, *τύχην θανόντες* 1058 with the context [see the edd. of Jebb and of Wunder-Wecklein], *ἁμαρτάνουσιν ἔπη.* 1096 [see 1107–8], *ἄλμα κουφιεῖν* 1287). In all these matters certainty is of course impossible owing to the scantiness of the extant remains. Yet the conclusion seems amply justified that this section of the Ajax is not so much prosaic as unpoetical, and that this is due, not to the presence of distinctively prosaic words or phrases, but rather to the lack of a noteworthy number of positively poetical elements, and to the presence of a very large number of phrases and words of purely neutral tone. This of itself does not of course disprove the Sophoclean origin of the passage. The section might well be one of the poet's weak places in which, in the words of "Longinus" and of Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[9] he did not flame and soar, but was quenched and grovelled miserably. But we must first consider the metrical evidence of the senarii.

From line 1040 to the end of the play, there are 320 iambic trimeters, in which there occur 8 resolved feet (or 13 including those formed by a proper name),[10] that is, 2.5 (or 4.3) resolutions per hundred lines. This is practically

χανεῖν 1227; (*d*) *usages found here only,* as *γεννήσῃ* 1077, *ὑπασπίδιον* 1408; (*e*) eight *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα,* as *ἀνοιμωκτί* 1227.

On the significance and force of poetic words in prose (and by implication, the danger of classifying without sufficient evidence) see A. W. Verrall, *On Literary Association and the Disregard of it in "Longinus,"* in *Class. Rev.*, 1905, p. 202.

[9] De Subl., 33. 5; Vet. Scr. Cens., 2. 11. I suspect borrowing or a common source. On "Longinus," see Verrall above cited.

[10] The figures given here and later are largely based on the lists given by C. F. Müller, *De pedibus solutis in dialogorum senariis Æschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis,* Berlin, 1866. The number 8 given above includes *ἱκέτης* 1172, which should perhaps be *ἵκτης.*

identical with the proportion in the Electra, 2.9 and in the Antigone, 3.7.[11] Its significance lies in the fact that in the rest of the play 705 trimeters show 54 resolutions = 7.6 per hundred lines.[12] The contrast thus presented cannot be ignored and it is the more striking and significant in view of the excitement and passion pervading the last part of the play.[13]

To sum up, then: The general tone, spirit, and diction of our passage do not of themselves prove its non-Sophoclean origin; but when taken in connection with the striking contrast in metrical forms,—a proportion of 2.5 against 7.6,—they seem decisively to forbid our assigning the two sections to the same author. The passage seems to have been entirely worked over by some other than Sophocles, and not merely to have been interpolated here and there as suggested above (p. 5).[14]

From what was said above (pp. 2 ff.) it is evident that Sophocles, unless he left the play unfinished, could hardly have ended it with the lament of Teucer, and that his conclusion therefore has in part at least been supplanted by our present ending. Can we date the latter? The evidence available is quite unsatisfactory, and must be taken as indicating probabilities rather than establishing even relative certainties.

[11] The O. T. shows 6.2, Tr. 5.9, O. C. 5.2, Phil. 10.8.

[12] Possibly fourteen lines (ten trimeters in the commos 364–93 and four in the epiparodos 866–76) should be deducted = 691 = 7.8.

[13] Van Leeuwen argues (pp. 16–39) that the *two successive resolutions* in 1302, the *anapest* in the first foot of 1302, and the *diæresis* in 1377, which occur elsewhere in Sophocles' extant work, but rarely until the Philoctetes, prove a late date for these lines. But other occurrences of these same forms, both in the Ajax and in the other plays, weaken the argument.

[14] This is of course not denying the possibility of interpolations existing in our extant copies, or the survival of original Sophoclean elements in the ending as it is to-day (see p. 15). That the passage could not be a *later* work of Sophocles is shown by the foregoing evidence, especially that of the metre (n. 11 above).

First let us note those passages within the disputed section which can be paralleled in the extant fifth century[15] literature.

Ai. 1207–9 = Agam. 559–64 (note also 12 and 335–6): compare Od. 14. 472 ff. (the sufferings of the Greeks from inclement weather under the walls of Troy). The Homeric passage seems plainly to have been in the mind of Æschylus, because of the similarity of the two descriptions and the notable clearness and detail of each.[16] Because of the close resemblance of thought and context the lines from the Ajax can be joined with these, and more closely with the Æschylean verses. Since Æschylus reflects Homer much more strongly than he does the "Sophoclean" lyric, and because the latter resembles the Æschylean passage more closely than it does the Homeric, it seems to me hardly likely that the "Sophoclean" verses could have antedated the Agamemnon.[17] Hence the probability is that they are later than 458 B. C.[18]

Ai. 1253–4 = Ant. 477–8 (the efficacy of small things against great). This thought is a commonplace of all literature; and the verses from the Antigone are in form and context much like 710 ff. of the same play, which passage seems to have been taken from Herodotus 7. 10. (6). But Ant. 477–8, because of the situation depicted, has apparently a far closer connection with Ai. l. l. than with Hdt. l. l.

[15] None have been obtainable from fourth century works; and since the lines, as will be shown, must antedate 300, Alexandrian works need not be considered.

[16] I know of no other passage (except Ai. l. l.) which can be compared with these. Antig. 356 and context may possibly echo Homer, but this is more than doubtful.

[17] On the whole matter of "Associated Reminiscence" see A. B. Cook, *Class. Rev.*, 1901, pp. 338 ff.; 1902, pp. 146 ff., and 256 ff.. Also Böckh, *Gr. Trag. Princ.*, pp. 241 ff.. Worth noting is F. Schroeder, *De iteratis apud tragicos Græcos* (diss. Strasburg), Argentorati, 1882.

[18] Note the similarity of words and especially of sounds in the following passages: Ai. 1353 = Agam. 943 (in the latter read *πίθου* (or *ἴτ δ' οὖ*; Schoemann)· *κρατεῖς* (Weil) *μέν τοι παρείς γ'* (Karsten; or omit *γ'* with Thiersch and Enger) *ἐκὼν ἐμοί* (or Keck *κρατεῖς τοι τόδε παρεῖς γ' . . .*); Ai. 1325 = Eum. 799. There are no parallels to the end of the Ajax in the Aiantia: fr. 175 (Arm. Iud.) rather = Ai. 190.

or Ant. 710 ff.: note Ai. 1235 = Ant. 478–9 ("insolent slaves"). And since Creon after speaking of the overthrow of stubborn things, seems to add *opera dedita* the figure of the "small bridle," it is possible that "Sophocles" had in mind the "small ox-goad" of Ai. 1253–4.[19]

Ai. 1242–3, 1248–9 = Phil. 456–7 (the base man defeats the noble). The situation and the spirit of bitterness toward the Atridæ and Odysseus seem to prove that the passages are connected: in fact the section from the Philoctetes is a sort of second Armorum Iudicium with Neoptolemus as the center, so that, were there clear verbal parallels, we should be tempted to consider the end of the Ajax as without doubt the original of the other verses.[20]

The only possible deduction from the above evidence is that the passage can apparently be connected with certain fifth century works and may have been composed between 458 (Orestia) or 440 (Antigone), and 409 (Phil.).

The evidence furnished by the metrical character of the senarii is almost equally unsatisfactory. The plays which

[19] Cf. also Ai. 1379 ff. = Ant. 196 and 41 (Odysseus and Ismene sharing the burial services); Ai. 1410–11 = Ant. 43 (possibly ἐπι-κουφίζειν = "lift up" occurs first in Sophocles: used of burial, I find it in no other passages); Ai. 1310–11 = Ant. 71–2, 502 ff. et al. ("a glorious death") with Ant. 511 = Ai. 1305; possibly the Antigone is here the source. For the relation of the gods to the burial (Schol. Ai. 1131) see below.

[20] The end of the Ajax may also be connected with the Euripidean tetralogy of 438, as shown by the following: Ai. 1057–60 = Alc. 295, 297–8; Ai. 1128 = Alc. 666; Ai. 1102 = E. Telephus fr. 723; Ai. 1111–12 = E. Tel. fr. 722; the form of the Aerope myth used in the Ajax (1295–7) seems to be that followed by Eur. in the Cressæ. See, however, p. 47, n. 36. The testimony of Clem. Alex. as to the relation of the Ai. to Eur. Med. (below, p. 14, n. 38) is by no means conclusive. The interruption of the quarrel between Œdipus and Creon in the O. T. by Jocasta is worth comparing with the intervention of Odysseus in the Ajax; for direct parallels see Ai. 1316 = O. T. 631; Ai. 1324 (and context) = O. T. 640 and 642 (with context); Ai. 1370 = O. T. 671–2. Ai. 1140 f. = E. Suppl. 566 ff.; the excessive diplomatic politeness and strutting dignity of the Theban herald suggests a reminiscence of the curt vigor of the other passage.

are closest to our passage in the number of resolutions per hundred lines are: Ant. 3.7 and S. El. 2.9 (roughly 442–432); P. V. 4.9, Agam. 4.6, and Eum. 4.5 (458 and earlier.)[21] As to the authors of whose works only fragments survive, nothing certain can be deduced. A careful study of the fragments shows that from Neophron through the fourth century, none (from whom we have ten or more trimeters) seem to have avoided resolutions, while most appear to have employed them quite freely, especially those dating after 400 B. C., as Chæremon and Theodectes. But the Alexandrians, Moschion, Lycophron, Sosiphanes, and Sositheus, though we have some comparatively long fragments,—*e. g.*, one of 33 lines from Moschion, of 21 from Sositheus (from a satyr play at that),—show no resolutions whatever.[22] From this we may infer that our passage belongs most naturally somewhere before, say 430, or else in the third century, *unless*—as is almost equally possible—its metrical character represents a hobby or personal peculiarity of some poet,[23] or the youthful work of some fifth century writer.[24]

A narrower limit is perhaps indicated by the violent political spirit above noted, which may reflect the lack of self-control on the part of the Demos, seen early in the Peloponn-

[21] The Cho. shows 6.1; for the other Æschylean plays the figures are higher (except the Suppl. 4.7), Sept. 9.1, Pers. 10.7. Among the Euripidean plays may be cited Alc. 5.9 (438), Med. 6.6 (431), Tro. 22.3 (415), Hel. 28.1 (412). The figures for the other Sophoclean plays are given p. 7, n. 11.

[22] Fr. 10 of Moschion (with 3 ress. in 2 lines) has rightly been rejected by Meineke. Lycophron's *satyr*-play Menedemus has 6 ress. in 13 lines (yet the satyric Lityerses of Sositheus shows none in 21 lines); Lycophron's Alexandra, according to Christ (*Gr. Lit.*, 1905, 561, n. 1), has only 19 resolutions in 1474 lines.

[23] A probable instance of such independence in the fourth century is the Rhesus,—proportion of ress. 8.2; see Rolfe, *The Tragedy Rhesus*, in *Harv. Stud.*, IV, 61 ff. (esp. 91–2).

[24] Hardly of the fourth or of the end of the fifth, for we should then expect an exaggeration of the metrical laxity in vogue in those days.

nesian war[25] as in the revolt of Mitylene, or later, in 406 in the case of the generals at Arginusæ:[26] the feeling of weariness with the war expressed in the stasimon 1185–1222 may point to the same period. Possibly there is a reference to the Corinthian war of 395, or to the rise of the Second Empire, or even to the aggressions of Thebes or of Macedon.[27] But a date later than 338 (or 335) seems to me highly improbable.

Finally we should notice the use of antithesis and assonance, chiefly in lines 1085–6, 1089–90, 1140–41, 1248–9: also in 1129 and 1353; note further the word-skirmishes of 1120–26. Of similar significance is the parallelism in the structure of the long speeches. Both Menelaus and Agamemnon first state the situation (1052–70 = 1226–45), then present the arguments and discuss general principles (1071–88 = 1246–52), and finally threaten Teucer (1089–90 = 1253–63). Correspondingly Teucer addresses first the chorus or Ajax (1093–6 = 1266–71), then replies to the charges (1097–1114 = 1272–1303), finally, nothing daunted, himself defies his enemies (1115–17 = 1304–15). The same thing is to be seen in the earlier part of the play, 430–80 = 992–1026. Such stylistic features suggest the work of the rhetoricians of the last third of the fifth century, as Gorgias and Antiphon.[28] It is a question whether these

[25] A. Schöll's *Sophokles, sein Leben u. Wirken*, pp. 240 ff., is interesting but hardly to be followed in all details. For an earlier date than above suggested see Christ. *Gr. Lit.* (1905), 247, n. 2.

[26] Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, ed. 1893–(1904), 3. 2. 1597–1609 (especially 1609); also Croiset, *Hist. Lit.*, 3, 584; see Thuc., 2. 65. 12, Frogs 686–702, Plat. Menex. 243 D.

[27] Although the political weariness and relative indifference following the surrender of Athens finds a negative reflection in contemporary literature (Croiset, *Lit. Gr.*, 3. 584–6), external politics still received considerable attention from the comedians, at least during the next quarter century or so (Denis, *Comédie Grecque*, 2. 291 ff., esp. 306–320).

[28] See the "Encomium of Helen" throughout, especially pars. 6 ff.; on Antiphon and also Thucydides, see P. Both, *De Antiphontis et Thucydidis genere dicendi* (diss. Marburg, 1875), pp. 61–64 with examples.

tricks of style were taken by the poets from the rhetoricians, or *vice versa*. Yet in their simpler forms they are characteristic of this age in particular, and except as noted above are comparatively rare in Sophocles as we know him. On the other hand, aside from these "mechanical" features, the style of the passage is notably simple and direct, and free from rhetorical adornment,—features which one would hardly associate with the fourth century, when the influence of artificiality was so strong.[29] If these arguments are sound, they will with a considerable degree of probability place the passage in the latter part of the fifth century.[30]

The foregoing evidence, then, while it establishes nothing certain, makes it not improbable that the present ending of the Ajax belongs to the last third of the fifth century.

From the foregoing we can reasonably infer that the author of the passage was one whose style closely approached that of Sophocles,[31] who either by nature or through immaturity was not master of a distinctively poetic diction, and who in composing controversial dialogues, tended to introduce the elements of violence and personal abuse. In fact, if he was revising an original ending of Sophocles (as I shall later, p. 15, show to be likely), it seems probable that he so

[29] Croiset, *Hist. Lit.*, 3. 364–70; also 371–4, and 4. 652–3; Bernhardy, 2. 2. 42 f..

[30] The passage is thought by Bergk and others to show traces of Euripidean influence which would date it 420–400 or later; for example, the anti-Spartan spirit (cp. Androm. 445 ff.; Verrall, *Four Plays of Euripides*), and the disparaging references to archery in 1120–23 and elsewhere (cp. Eur. Phaeth., fr. 785, and the H. F., 159–64, 188–203). Yet Euripides was not the only anti-Laconian poet in Athens; and references to democratic institutions, so common in his works, *e. g.*, the Suppl., are almost totally wanting here (see 1136); contrast the end of the Septem. Some seven words or usages occurring in these lines are found elsewhere only in the fourth century or later: but such negative evidence is valueless.

[31] That the defenders of the passage seem to be in the majority is sufficient indication of this.

worked it over as to give the discussion more vim and life of this kind, after the manner of the real debates in the Assembly and the Courts. Now since the author was also probably a contemporary of Sophocles, I believe that he must have been Iophon, or Sophocles the Younger, or some close literary friend of the poet's whom we are absolutely unable to identify; for no others, not even actors, would, in my opinion, have had the privilege or opportunity of working over to so great an extent the old Master's plays during his lifetime.[32]

Iophon, according to O. Wolff,[33] was probably born about 460, and survived his father by some fifteen years. As to his literary character and abilities, the available evidence seems to show that he was not the inferior writer of tradition, but a good poet of the second rank, with a style not unlike his father's, with whom he seems to have collaborated.[34]

Sophocles the Younger can hardly be considered. His literary ability is attested by his numerous victories, one in 396,[35] and his presentation of his grandfather's Coloneus in 401; tradition[35a] also makes him a special favorite of the old man. Yet we have no fragments of his that we can identify; he must have worked mostly in the fourth century,[36] and

[32] Of Sophocles' natural son Ariston, even with Diog. Laert., 7. 164, we know nothing. For the lyric and tragic poet Sophocles of 200 B. C. (*C. I. G.*, 1584, 28–9) see Suidas s. v. Soph. (d).

[33] *De Iophonte poeta tragico* (diss.), Misniæ, 1884, p. 4 f.; Böckh, *Princ. Gr. Tr.*, p. 36, 115. See also Van Leeuwen's ed. of the Frogs, (1896) on v. 73.

[34] For details see Excursus A, p. 25. The attempt of Bergk and others to assign him the passage on the ground of his "frigidity" of style (cf. Schol. Ai. 1123 with Schol. Ar. Ran. 78, ed. Dübner; *but see below*, p. 26, n. 1) seems justified by the character neither of the poet nor of the passage; the latter certainly is full of vigor, and well calculated to hold an audience (Jebb, *Ajax*, [xliv–]xlv, n. 1). Iophon's weaknesses seem to have been of a different character.

[35] Diod. Sic., 14. 53, who gives him 12; Suidas says 7, besides elegies (s. v. Soph. c.).

[35a] Vit. Soph. 7.

[36] Aristophanes does not mention him in the Frogs.

his apparent popularity at that time may imply that he used the laxer metrical forms then in vogue.

There is no other fifth century writer, whom with our present knowledge we might suggest.[37] It is therefore quite possible that the author was Iophon, because of his date and his relation to Sophocles, and also because his style seems to have been not unlike his father's,—and for all its defects our passage can hardly be called decidedly un-Sophoclean. If we are correct in this, we are further warranted, I think, in assuming that the passage is the work of his earlier years and may be placed about 435–425,[38] first, because of its relative poetical inferiority and crudeness already discussed; and second, because of the metrical character of the lines: for it is not unlikely that in his earlier years he used stricter metrical forms, either naturally or in imitation of his father, who in the Antigone, *c.* 440, shows a proportion of resolutions of 3. 7 and in the Electra, which perhaps antedates 428[39] at the latest, of 2.9 (figures not far from the 2.1 of our passage),—at which period Iophon may have been twenty-five or thirty years of age,—and these too were the strenuous days around the beginning of the War. Yet it is equally

[37] If the passage belongs to the fourth century we might mention the younger Astydamas (Nauck, *T. G. F.*, p. 777), Carcinus (p. 797) or Theodectes (p. 801), who all treated the story. Worth noting are the two "controversiæ" of "Antisthenes" (Baiter u. Sauppe, *Orr. Att.* (1850), 2. 167–8), entitled "Aias" and "Odysseus," partly because they show how an inferior writer might handle our passage, chiefly because the harangue of Odysseus is in many ways similar to that of Agamemnon in the play; see Radermacher in *Rh. Mus.*, 47 (N. F.), 569 ff.. The Alexandrian (?) Moschion might also be mentioned, because he was a writer of historical tragedies which discussed the right of an outlaw to burial; and he seems to have observed rigid metrical laws in the trimeter (p. 10): but perhaps he was too much of a philosopher (fr. 6); see O. Ribbeck, *Ueber einige historische Dramen der Griechen*, in *Rh. Mus.*, 30 (N. F.), p. 145 ff..

[38] Clemens Alex., Strom, 6. 740 P, comparing Med. 618 with Ai. 665, says that the latter play followed the former. See also above, p. 9, n. 19, on Ant. 71, 502 etc. = Ai. 1310.

[39] Christ, *Gr. Lit.*, 250–1.

possible, so far as the evidence goes, that some friend of Sophocles, whom we can not identify, may be responsible for our passage.[40]

Whether, and to what extent, the present ending is based on previous work of Sophocles cannot be definitely determined. Three cases are possible. (1) Sophocles left the Ajax uncompleted, breaking off with the lament of Teucer, and left no sketch or notes for the remainder. Then either (*a*) the present ending was added by some other than a kinsman or family friend, of either the fifth or the fourth century. If so, it is quite impossible to conjecture what may be the relation between the present ending and what Sophocles had in mind when he wrote the main part of the play. But this supposition has already been shown[41] to be most unlikely. Or (*b*) the passage was added entire during his lifetime by some kinsman or personal friend. Against this otherwise quite possible hypothesis it can be urged that certain details in these verses which remind one strongly of Sophocles seem to indicate that the present passage is a revision of the latter's work; *e. g.,* the diction of lines 1057–61, and parts of Teucer's second speech, as 1283–87; the greater part of the stasimon 1185–1222;[42] the commonplaces on good government in 1073–76, 1079–84, which resemble those of Creon, Ant. 663–76 et al.; the part of Odysseus throughout. (2) Sophocles, when he wrote the main part also completed an ending, the general trend of which must have been as suggested above, p. 2, which ending the revisor modified only so far as to give more zest and "up-to-date" political interest to a passage which impressed

[40] We shall presently see that the question of the precise authorship is not essential to the remainder of our discussion.

[41] P. 13.

[42] See Schol. on 1199.

him as too dull and lifeless,[43] in other things keeping Sophocles' general point of view and line of argument. This seems altogether the most satisfactory theory:[44] *and it is not necessary to this part of our discussion that we be able to fix upon the precise author;* that he was with comparative certainty a contemporary, and probably a friend or relative, of Sophocles (p. 13) is enough for our present purposes.

If then we can discover from the present ending the general point of view and line of argument of the orginal Sophoclean ending in the matter of the burial of the hero, and compare them with the arguments used in the similar case in the Antigone, we may be able to fix with relative accuracy the date of the *original* ending of the Ajax.

A change and advance in point of view on the part of Sophocles during the interval separating these two plays is to be expected, first from the frequency with which questions of burial-rights arose during the fifth century. It will suffice to mention the refusal of Pausanias to outrage the corpse of the Persian Mardonius,[45] the attempted refusal of the Bœotians in 424 to surrender the Athenian dead at Delium,[46] and the slaughter and exposure of the four thousand Athenian prisoners at Ægospotami by Lysander.[47] As Leopold

[43] Bergk (*Comm. de vita Soph.*, p. xxxv [in his ed. of Soph., 1858]; *Litt.-gesch.*, 3. 388) and others have suggested that the Ajax was originally part of a trilogy in the Æschylean manner; Christ, *Gr. Lit.*, pp. 246–7; Ribbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 19; but cp. Klein, *Gesch. d. Drama's*, 1, pp. 362–3, and Dindorf, *Poet. Sc. Gr.*, ed. 5, proleg., p. 14.

[44] Certainly if Iophon is the author, for he would hardly have added the ending before 440, when about twenty years old; but the arguments for the hero's burial show an earlier,—not a less mature,—point of view than what we have in the Antigone of 440 (see below, p. 20). As to the details of the original ending we can only conjecture: Bergk's "deus ex machina" seems strangely arbitrary.

[45] Herodotus, 9. 78–79.

[46] Thuc. 4. 97–101; with this event Schöll (*Soph. Leben u. Wirken*, 245, n. 119, also 240 ff.) connects the Ajax.

[47] Paus. 9. 32. (9)6.

Schmidt points out,[48] the Athenians seem to have been particularly sensitive to any breach of the Hellenic law against willful exposure of enemies.[49] As to traitors and those guilty of sacrilege, Attic law of the fifth and fourth centuries, and so Hellenic law generally, prescribed that their corpses be cast over the boundaries (where, however, they could be buried).[50] We might cite the cases of Pausanias, Themistocles, and Antiphon.[51] Finally we have only to note the reflection of these and similar events in the Eleusinii, Thraces, and Phryges of Æschylus, the Septem, the Ajax and the Antigone, the Euripidean Supplices and Phœnissæ, to understand the remark of the philosopher Bion[52] that "the contest concerning burial has made many tragedies."[53]

That Sophocles wrote plays for the purpose of discussing this or any *problem* is questionable;[54] yet when he wrote, it is quite certain that he would as occasion offered reflect his own or his contemporaries' views. But that he himself was particularly interested in these problems, is further seen in

[48] *Ethik der alten Griechen*, 2. (97–)110.

[49] Isocr. Panath., 268–9.

[50] Meier u. Schoemann, *Att. Proc.* (ed. 1883–7), 422; Xen. Hell., 1. 7, 22; Hyperid. Lyc., 20; Thuc., 1. 126 and 138; Plut. Mor., 549 A; also *C. I. A.*, 2. 17. 11. 61–63. Diod. Sic., 16. 25; Teles the philosopher in Stob. Flor., 40. 8; Rohde *Ps.* (ed. 1907), 1. 217. See L. C. Grieve, *Death and Burial in Attic Tragedy*, Pt. 1, *Death and the Dead*, New York, 1897; also G. Iwanowitsch, *Opiniones Homeri et tragicorum græcorum de inferis*, Berlin, 1894. Both these authors, however, leave the discussion of burial problems for later treatment. Suicides were deprived of full rites: Arist., Nic. Eth., 5. 1138 A (par. 3); Æsch., in Ctes., 244 (see ed. of Gwatkin and Shuckburgh).

[51] Thuc., 1. 134 and 138; Plut., Themist. 32; Mor. 834 A–B; also Lycurg., c. Leocr. 112–115.

[52] In Stob. Flor. 40. 8; where Jacobs amends the MSS., "the *ignorance* concerning, etc.," to "the *contest*, etc."

[53] See below, p. 35.

[54] Yet see, *e. g.*, Prof. Earle's *Œdipus Tyrannus*, pp. 51–3, 238–42, where the possibility that Sophocles is attacking Pericles in vv. 863–910 of that play is favorably discussed. This, however, is hardly a "problem" as the word is here used.

the fact that he not only gave them a vital place in at least two of his plays, but was also very probably the first of post-epic writers to treat the burial of Polynices by Antigone, and possibly also the first to tell of Teucer's defence of his brother's corpse against outrage. (As the arguments in support of these points have no direct bearing on the present question, I will discuss them elsewhere.[55])

Before proceeding to a comparison of these two plays on this point, a possible objection must be considered. It may be claimed that we are not justified in comparing the arguments used, because in the Antigone the problem is not the burial of Polynices as such but rather the conflict between divine and human law; similarly the burial of Ajax as such is not the problem of the other play, but the vindication of the hero's character; in each case a burial problem chances to be the external form with which the discussion is clothed; something else *might* conceivably have been used by the poet; and furthermore the point of view of the Antigone,—the supremacy and impartial operation of the divine laws,—would be impossible in the Ajax, with its different function and object; and similarly, that of the Ajax, in the Antigone. This distinction is perfectly true in itself. But on the other hand, the problem *has* been introduced by Sophocles, and it is hardly likely that in either case he would fail to voice the real feeling of himself or of his associates; or would have introduced the problem without in some way modifying the myth, *if* the discussions involved would not represent his actual view. In other words, I believe that each play presents a spontaneous and "bona fide" exposition of the right of an outlaw to burial, as Sophocles conceived it in each case. *An artificial or assumed viewpoint* seems to me *hardly to be expected from the man* (nor until the very end of the fifth century at the earliest). For, besides this, the whole ques-

[55] Excursus B (p. 27) and C (p. 33).

tion as has been shown was so interesting and important to the Athenians of Sophocles' day, as to himself also, that we may confidently hold that the problem, with all its dramatic bearings, was in each case discussed on its own merits and for its own sake.

As said elsewhere (pp. 12 f.) the purpose of the revisor of the Ajax seems to have been to increase the "political" zest and life of the original ending by adding (or intensifying) the elements of violence and vituperation. These features we see chiefly in the speeches of Menelaus, Teucer, and Agamemnon. Therefore these parts are in all probability farthest from the original Sophoclean work. That continuous portion which is most Sophoclean in tone and manner is the closing scene with Odysseus:[56] and just here, the relation of the gods to the question involved is most clearly and fully set forth,—vv. 1342–5 (also 1347, '49, '55). In the Ajax as also in the Antigone a rebel and outlaw is to be buried by a near kinsman, against the commands of the civil authorities. The Ajax represents not the current or legal view that if he is a traitor he must be denied burial; nor even the possibility of extenuating circumstances, as in the Septem 1054. Rather as Odysseus says, the gods demand his burial because he is fundamentally and essentially a "good" man.[57] That is, for an essentially and predominantly "good" man the gods demand burial as the ultimate right, in spite of possible grave flaws in his life and character: "it is not right to do despite to a good man in death, whose virtues far outweigh his faults."[58] The divine laws here involve certain qualifications yet the position of Sophocles marks a considerable advance over the spirit of indiscriminate (and often vindictive) punishment underlying the popular and legal view.

[56] See above, p. 15.

[57] Possibly this is the real meaning of Teucer's words in 1129–33, though as the verses stand, their thought rather resembles that of Septem 1054.

[58] See Campbell, *Tragic Drama*, p. 163.

In the Antigone[59] there is frequently the simple assertion that the gods demand the burial as a thing due them (77, 925–6, 921: also note 65–66; 745 and 749; 278–9): elsewhere certain universal laws are referred to,—521, "Who knows if these views find respect below?", and 519, "Yet Hades at least demands these rites"; most clearly, however, in the wonderful lines 450 ff.. Here the divine laws seem to be closely connected with those of kinship-obligation and are everywhere superior to the decrees of the state, *i. e.*, every man must be allowed to bury his own kin: any opposition is "asebeia." But a higher belief is expressed in the words of the seer, 998–1022 and 1064–83, where voicing the will of the gods themselves he declares that Polynices must receive burial not as brother of Antigone but as a man, and neither Creon nor even the Gods Above have any right to interfere; to every man, even traitor or destroyer of shrines, burial must be permitted.[60]

The great advance in point of view is manifest.[61] But

[59] The Antigone and the Ajax being by the same author are the only plays which can safely be compared on this point. A brief examination of the other fifth century tragedies of which we know that discuss this theme will be given in Excursus D (p. 35).

[60] The fact that such malefactors could be buried in foreign soil does not affect the question. Wundt (*Philol.*, 1906, p. 358) maintains that Creon's crime was his (implied) refusal to allow the corpse to be buried over the boundaries. But this is forcing unwarranted conditions upon the situation in each play *as depicted.*

[61] The feeling on the subject of hatred *vs.* reconciliation may show a similar progression. Odysseus declares (1334–41, '47) that hatred must be kept within due bounds, and respect must always be shown such a hero as Ajax (1355–7), though death may not change one's feeling (1345; cf. 1372–3). But Antigone claims that Eteocles, though slain in single combat by his own brother, no longer cherishes hatred toward him (515–17); possibly she means that Hades himself demands this truce. J. Geffcken (*Das griechische Drama*, Leipzig und Berlin, 1904, p. 77 f.) thinks that the ending of the Ajax shows a higher plane of thought than is seen in the Antigone (and hence is later), because in the former "die Lehre von der Feindesliebe, von Verzeihen" is set forth, and that too by a layman and not a seer. But I do not think

how much time may have intervened between the two plays we can hardly say. One might suppose five or even ten years to have elapsed. Certainly if we consider at the same time the subtlety of conception with which this and the other problems of the Antigone are drawn, the depth of insight into different phases of human nature which is everywhere shown, the mastery of portrayal, the breadth and variety of subject-matter and treatment, and the life-like reality of the whole action, ten years will not seem too great an interval.

A certain amount of evidence, partly metrical, partly involving contemporary events, serves to place the exhibition of the Antigone somewhere near the end of the eighty-fourth Olympiad.[62] This being so, the original ending of the Ajax must have been composed about 450 B. C.

What was the form of the main part of the play at this time can only be conjectured. Because of the rôle of Odysseus in 1318 ff. I believe it was substantially as we have it to-day. The whole question of the history of this drama is very interesting as several chronological strata seem to be discernible and the play appears to have been worked over several times. Although this question does not strictly fall within the province of our present discussion it will not be amiss to summarize the evidence on this point and to suggest a theory which may serve to explain the various phenomena observed. Briefly stated: the long parados with its three-fold division,—anapests (134–71), lyrics (172–200), lyrics and anapests (201–62),—suggesting, as it does, the Æschy-

---

that Odysseus has really "forgiven his enemy," notwithstanding v. 1347 to the contrary. The fact that the burial problem is a mere episode in one play but the very heart of the other, might indicate the priority of the former. The divine powers are called simply "gods" in this discussion in the Ajax; in the Antigone they are clearly differentiated,—Justice, Hades, the Nether Gods and the Gods Above, etc., but we are not warranted in drawing any conclusion from this fact.

[62] Excursus E, p. 38.

lean manner,[63] might well be taken as among the oldest elements in the play. The large proportion of lyric verses in the section extending from the parados (134 ff.) through v. 1039,—335 out of 906, more than one-third,—also indicates an early date for this part.[64] Further C. Muff argues that the chorus numbered only 12 (l.l.). Within this same section there are only two actors on the stage at once (elsewhere only two speaking in the same dialogue). Of similar import are the long speeches of Tecmessa and of Ajax (note particularly the single speech of the scene vv. 646 ff.); and the general simplicity and relatively slow development of plot and action. On the other hand, the prologue 1–133 may be of a later date as it precedes the "Æschylean" parados and is in the style and manner of the most characteristic Sophoclean work; so too the dialogue portions of the scene 719–814.[65] The proportion of resolutions, 7.6 (p. 7), may indicate the same period of maturity. Finally the cases of antilabé in 591 ff. and 981 ff., with the metrical phenomena noted by Van Leeuwen,[66] *may* belong to Sophocles' later life.[67]

A plausible theory seems to be that in his early days, when

[63] See H. Weil, *Etudes sur le drame antique*, Paris, 1897; pp. 253–257 and foll..

[64] This includes the trimeters within the choral passages 348 ff., 364 ff., 394 ff., 879 ff., 925 ff.,—36 in all; in the last system cited v. 907 shows a dactyl in the third foot with an iamb in the corresponding verse 953. The text and the nature of the passage in 866 ff. being doubtful (see C. Muff, *die Chor. Techn. d. Soph.*, 72 ff.), the trimeters there have been excluded. Including the prologue (so, too, for the entire play), the proportion is about the same.

[65] Note the rather stiff "verbivelitatio" of 263–83.

[66] *Op. cit.*, pp. 12–39(–49), which see.

[67] Note in this connection the statement of Clemens Alex., Strom. 6. 740 P, that the Medea of Euripides preceded the Ajax, v. 618 of the former being cited as the source for v. 665 of the latter. The remarkable number of proverbial phrases scattered throughout the Ajax,—apt expressions of the hero's character (*e. g.*, 293, 679–80),—do not, as Geffcken (p. 77) thinks, indicate Euripidean influence and hence a relatively late date.

strongly under the influence of Æschylus,[68] Sophocles wrote verses 134 and the following, on through some sort of a lament by Teucer, intending the play to be part of a trilogy; but afterwards, about 450,[69] his own nature and methods having already asserted themselves, he added the present prologue, and modified the ending so that it presented the vindication of the hero (—which was perhaps to have occupied the next play of the trilogy),[70] at the same time revising the original, and perhaps inserting some of the passages which forecast the final outcome (above, p. 2).[71] Other changes in details doubtless followed from time to time until his death,—*possibly* those portions discussed by Van Leeuwen.[72] But about 430 when Iophon was beginning to test his wings, Sophocles allowed him to modify the ending of the year 450 as above suggested.[73] Iophon,—or whoever it

[68] See G. Mistriotis, *Welches ist das älteste Drama d. Soph.?* (in *Annales Internat. d'hist.* sect. 6 *hist. comp. des litt.*, 1901, pp. 259–70, especially 259–60.

[69] *Possibly* as early as 457, if the Stasimon 1185–1222 was part of this revision; for it has been shown above (p. 10) that vv. 1207–9 seem to show reminiscences of Agam. 559–64, etc., produced in 458.

[70] The discussion by Klein (*Gesch. d. Dram.*, 1. 362–3) is very interesting.

[71] Some such explanation must probably be given of the two-headed plot of the Trachinians. I think that the play was begun as a Deianeira-tragedy, but under the influence of Euripides' Mad Heracles the part of Heracles was greatly enlarged, and came to be treated in a way which was not inconsistent with the original plot but which destroyed the real unity of the drama as a whole. Cp. Wilamowitz, *Euripides Herakles*, 1. 343 ff., 382 ff.. See also Dr. Macurdy, *Chron. of ext. plays of Eur.*, pp. 61–68; Dieterich, *Schlafscenen auf der attischen Bühne* (in *Rh. Mus.* 46 N. F., 25–46); Prof. Earle in the *Trans. of the A. P. A.*, 1902, 5 ff., esp. 14; and Van Leeuwen, 44 ff., who trace in Sophocles' play the influence of the Alcestis and the Medea, but not the Heracles; it is interesting to note that Van Leeuwen places the division between the "older" and the "later" parts of the Trach., as he calls them, at v. 876,—just preceding the entrance of Heracles; Wilamowitz also notices a tone as of early work in the Trach..

[72] Pp. 12–39; note especially p. 19 ff. on Ai. 854.

[73] Pp. 13, 19.

was,—worked over the whole passage,—a revisor's hand is certified chiefly by the rigidity of the meter,—but except where he tried to give more vigor, as he conceived it, to the passage, kept quite closely to the original, which however suffered at his hands.[74]

But it is not *Sophocles'* work which would justly arouse adverse criticism. The situation in our passage, the point of view, and the underlying thought not only should command our admiration, but they are also indispensable to the play as a whole.[75] It is rather the lack of a distinctively poetic diction, the absence of the lofty tone of the first part, and chiefly, the element of abuse and vituperation, which offend us, and make us doubt the soundness of the section. Only when we recognize the presence of a redactor's hand in the last act can we fully appreciate this, one of the most "satisfying" of all Greek tragedies.

[74] He may have deliberately changed tribrachs, dactyls, or anapests into iambs, and possibly have also "corrected" or "improved" the diction throughout. As said above, certain lines,—1172, 1302, 1356, 1377,—may have been later inserted,—by "Iophon" or by Sophocles himself (Van Leeuwen, pp. 23–4, 32–3).

[75] Campbell's discussion of this point (*Tragic Drama*, pp. 77–91) is interesting, but the heart of the question seems to me to lie elsewhere,—in the inherent necessity for the vindication of the hero,—albeit the Ajax is one of the few Greek dramas involving the overthrow of the hero, which also presents his vindication. I believe that some such feeling as this, among other things, led to the writing of the Coloneus.

EXCURSUS A.

On Iophon's Literary Work and Character (p. 13).

Suidas says that he brought out fifty plays (only four and one half trimeters survive to our knowledge). He was placed second against Euripides in 432 (Arg. Hipp.), and further gained "brilliant victories" during his father's lifetime (Schol. Ar. Ran., 73); he even entered the lists against his father (Soph. Vit., 11). He also brought out plays "with his father" (*ib.;* Suid.). A misunderstanding or perversion of the last statement may have given rise to the reproach that his father wrote his plays for him (Schol. Ar. Ran., 73, 75, 78, and Aristophanes himself, Frogs, 78). On the tradition that the Antigone is his (Cram. *Anecd. Oxon.,* 4, 315. 38) see Wolff (*op. cit.*). More reliable than the criticism of the scholiast on Frogs 78 that he was "frigid" and "long-winded" or "languid" (see note at end of Excursus), is the judgment of Aristophanes himself in the passage (Frogs, 73) that all the survivors of the great Triad are inferior poets, and Iophon "is the only thing left, of course, that's good, if indeed he is that, for I'm not quite sure even about that"; so he resolves to leave him to himself a while to test whether his literary work is really his own or not. This merely proves that Iophon either received help from his father, as already shown, or was a close imitator of him, or possessed a naturally similar style and method. It does not prove him an inferior poet, but rather one of more than mediocre worth. In fact the Scholiast as well as Aristophanes himself implies that the rumor of excessive paternal help arose from the very excellence of Iophon's work. This squares with the report of his second place in 432 and of his

"brilliant victories" before 406, and with the story that he competed with his father. The charge of "frostiness" and "languor" may be based[1] in part on a lack of those higher gifts of inspiration which characterize the greatest poets, among them his own father; and also on the inevitable contrast with Sophocles, by whom he was naturally overshadowed, and whose style and method his own, unfortunately, happened to resemble, as it seems; something may also be due to the comic poets who would not leave such excellent material unused.

[1] This criticism seems to occur in ancient authorities only in Schol. Ar. Ran., 78, as given by Dübner (*Schol. Gr.*, Paris, 1843), who brackets the statement, but without comment (so Blaydes, ed. Ran., 1889, p. 204). Rutherford (*Schol. Ar.*, 1896, 1. p. 290) omits the passage without comment. Croiset (*Lit. Gr.*, 3. 355) does not refer to it. Wolff (*op. cit.*, p. 28) dismisses it as an invention of some comedian or scholiast. Possibly then those who accept it, as Bergk (*Litt.-gesch.*, 3. 382, n. 87, without comment) and Bernhardy (*Grundr.*, 2. 2. p. 55) do so without sufficient warrant.

EXCURSUS B

The Originality of the Plot of the Antigone. The Authenticity of Septem 1040–1084 (p. 18).

The earliest known post-epic appearance of the story of Antigone is either in the Septem 1040–1084, or in the Antigone of Sophocles.[1] Two questions at once present themselves; the authenticity of the end of the Septem, and the degree of originality in this and in the Sophoclean play. I shall consider the latter first.

Several old myths seem more or less directly to have involved the story of Polynices,—the Œdipodia, the legends of Amphiaraos, Alcmeon, Adrastus, and the Epigoni; and the Thebais which appears to have been founded upon them all.[2] Whether or not any of these knew of the burial of the Argive chieftains is a moot point. Gruppe (p. 536, n. 4) with others maintains that they did, Bethe (pp. 94–99) denies it. Probably, according to the oldest tales, the corpses of the leaders were left exposed. The late[3] Thebais cer-

[1] The Phœnissæ of Euripides, date 411–08 (Dr. G. H. Macurdy, *The Chronology of the Extant Plays of Euripides*, pp. 118 ff.), seems to combine original features with elements from the Ant. and the O. T.. The Euripidean Antigone, as shown by the elements of pathos and romance introduced, seems both later than the Sophoclean, and original in its differences therefrom; see Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon*, s. v. *Antigone;* Pauly-Wissowa, 1. 2402–3 c and d (Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* [Müll. *Hdbch.*, 5. 2. ed. 1906], p. 536, n. 7); J. M. Paton, *The Antigone of Eur.*, in *Harv. Stud.*, 1901, 267 ff.. The Antigone of the elder Astydamas is known only by title (*C. I. A.* 2. 973. 3–6: Nauck, *T. G. F.*, p. 777).

[2] Gruppe, *op. cit.*, pp. 501–3 and ff.; Wecklein, *Theb. Cycl.* (in *Sitzb. d. bay. Akad. zu München*, 1901), p. 676 ff.; Bethe, *Theb. Heldenlieder;* Corssen, *die Ant. des Soph.*, 15–37. Bethe, pp. 39 ff., thinks that the Thebais included the tale of the Epigoni.

[3] Bethe, p. 39.

tainly described their burial, but by Adrastus, not Antigone.[4] In fact, these stories, though they may have mentioned Antigone as among the children of Œdipus,[5] do not appear to have given her any important part in the events narrated. The prominence of the legend of Adrastus, in the Thebais and elsewhere, together with the tradition of his eloquence,[6] in contrast to the late and scanty references to the story of Antigone (see below), warrant the conclusion that the greater and better known of the epics (including the Thebais), in so far as they affirmed the burial of the heroes, celebrated Adrastus,[7] to the practical exclusion of Antigone.[8] But there is certain evidence that her deed in some form was described in early legend. Ion of Chios reports her death at the hands of Eteocles' son Laodamas during the war of the Epigoni,[9] which may imply a story of vengeance for her burial of Polynices. The only other trace of her history prior to the fifth century that I can find is in the story told by Pausanias in 9. 25. 2 about the so-called Σύρμα Ἀντιγόνης which name he says was given to all the Neitean Region of Thebes "because, when (Antigone), though eager to carry the corpse of Polynices, found not at all the strength to do

[4] A comparison of Pind. O. 6.13 ff. with the schol. (see Christ's ed., 1896 ad loc.) makes it highly probable that the Thebais represented Adrastus as at some time and place unspecified (—for the words, "I miss . . . a goodly warrior," seem to be all that came from the Thebais, the general situation being Pindar's own),—in possession of all the corpses but that of Amphiaraos. But see O. Schroeder's ed., 1900 ad loc..

[5] Gruppe, p. 510; Bethe, 165. Neither Homer, Hesiod, nor Pindar mention her, the last not unnaturally, in his evident desire to suppress all legends derogatory to his countrymen, such as the forbidding of the burial would be.

[6] Tyrtæus, 12.8 (B).

[7] The fact that these stories seem to have treated of *all* the chieftains, and that the post-epic legends which refer to all of them describe their burial by Adrastus, may indicate the same thing.

[8] Had her heroic devotion been narrated in any of these, we should, one would think, have heard something of it.

[9] Sallust, Arg. Ant.; Bethe, p. 27, n. 38, assigns this to the Œdipodia.

so, she bethought her of the plan of dragging[10] it; so she dragged it and cast it upon the pyre of Eteocles."[11] This legend may reflect writings of the fifth century (or even later), but the simplicity and naïveté of the story lead me to believe that it goes back ultimately to a very old and also little known myth. To sum up the whole question; I am inclined to think that the earliest forms of the legends knew nothing of the burial of Polynices or of any of the chiefs; that the growing spirit of humaneness, blending, as it were, with the myth of the eloquent Adrastus, led in epic times, at least when Thebais was composed, to the creating of the narrative of the surrender of the dead to Adrastus (—a sort of second "Hector's Ransom"); that this story with its splendid epic qualities of narrative, variety, movement, and adventure (—together with the Œdipodia and the Epigoni, if they existed separately), came early to dominate, in literature at least, the field of Theban mythology; but that the old original tale still survived, and at some date previous to the fifth century, perhaps even prior to the inception of the Thebais,[12] there arose a story of how Antigone buried her brother's corpse that had been left exposed along with the others; that this legend, though overshadowed by the others,[13] was more

[10] See Verrall in his ed. of the Septem on 1030 = 1044, with whom I do not entirely agree; *σύρμα* may imply "trailing" (cp. Heracl. in Nic. Eth., 10. 5. 8).

[11] The story of the dividing flames seems by its very character to be an invention of later times; see Hygin. Fab. 68; Philostr. Imag. 2. 29; Stat. Theb. 12. 429 ff.; Lucan Phars. 1. 550 ff.; Ov. Trist. 5. 5. 33–6. The legend of Paus. 9. 18. 3 is not necessarily connected with the above.

[12] Unless the story of Antigone,—if not a pure invention of the fifth century,—arose from a spirit of international rivalry and bad feeling (—so, apparently, the myth of Theseus in large measure) I believe that representing as it does the first step of moral progress away from a practice of indiscriminate exposure of enemies, it is the very earliest of all these "Theban" burial myths; see Wundt, *Philol.*, 1906, p. 374. (For other reasons Bethe, pp. 141–57, thinks the Œdipodia the oldest epic story of the series.)

[13] The *epic* qualities of the story, except as a mere detail in a long poem, seem to have been comparatively slight, especially in contrast to its immense *dramatic* possibilities.

or less known at all times,[14] but without attracting any particular interest until the Awakening of the fifth century,[15] and that the legend at this time told simply of the burial, possibly with some element of opposition involved; then either the author of Septem 1040 ff., or Sophocles,[15a] discovered it, and brought it into literature.

To which of these shall we assign the honor for this discovery? In other words, is the end of the Septem Æschylean?[16] Arguments directly in support of the lines are not many nor particularly convincing. The passage contains numerous words and phrases which are thoroughly Æschylean in tone.

1013. γῆς φίλαις κατασκαφαῖς.
1026. ταφέντ' ἀτίμως τοὐπιτίμιον λαβεῖν.
1027. τυμβοχόα χειρώματα.
1028. ὀξυμόλποις οἰμώγμασιν.
1040. κοιλογάστορες.
1042. κατασκαφὰς[17] μηχανήσομαι.
1046. μαχανὴ δραστήριος.
1059. ὦ μεγάλαυχοι καὶ φθερσιγενεῖς Κῆρες.
1061. πρυμνόθεν.
1069. μονόκλαυτον θρῆνον ἀδελφῆς.
1083. κύματι φωτῶν κατακλυσθῆναι τὰ μάλιστα.[18]

[14] Bethe, 165, n. 9; also Christ, *Litt.-gesch.*, 247, n. 5.

[15] In the Peace vv. 1270 ff. (date 421) Aristophanes introduces a small boy singing snatches from the Epigoni (so Schol.).

[15a] See below, p. 32.

[16] On the whole question see Schöll, *Hall. Allgem. Litt.-zeit.*, 1848, 193 ff.; Oberdick, *De exitu fab. Æsch. q. S. c. Th. inscr.*, 16; Bergk, *Gr. Litt.*, 3. 302; P. Corssen (above cited); J. Königsbeck, *De S. c. Th. exitu;* M. Wundt, *Philol.*, 1906, 357 ff. (above noticed); Wilamowitz, *Drei Schlussscenen griechischer Dramen* (in *Sitzb. d. pr. Akad.*, 1903, p. 436 ff.); also in *Hermes*, 17. 354 and 21, 606; A. F. Näke, *Rh. Mus.*, 27, pp. 203 and 213; Wecklein in *Sitzb. d. Münch. Akad.*, 1888, 2, 327 ff., and 1901, p. 676; and the several editions of the Septem.

[17] Of burial only here (Sept. 1013, 1042) and Ant. 920, 891.

[18] Christ's remark (p. 223), . . . "wir ganz und gar die Kühnheit der äschylischen Diktion vermissen," is unwarranted.

The verses present a less advanced view of the relations of the gods to the dead than is seen in the Antigone, as I shall show later (p. 36). The heroine in the Septem is curiously —and delightfully—"youthful" and naïve: she gives no reasons for her hope of success, but she never doubts for a moment. The Sophoclean Antigone, worn and harrowed by her terrible experiences, and so more deeply human, knows that death may be her sole achievement (90–97, esp. 91). The contrast seems to be between an earlier and a later age; and besides, the Antigone of the Septem, with her unclouded expectation and determination,—a youthful Athens, shall we say?—finds a striking counterpart in Prometheus (albeit a Titan), in Orestes with the fearful odds against him, and in Eteocles amid the gathering shadows of Doom.[19]

The vital objection to the passage[20] is that with the entrance of the herald, there is suddenly obtruded, at the very end of the play and of the trilogy, a new element, a *new center of interest* (—and that, too, in a very short scene of 74 lines); the slow, steady, smooth flow and development of thought and action, so essentially Æschylean, are *suddenly shattered,*[21] as though the writer were paving the way for a new tragedy: the end of the Choephori is in point as a comparison. I do not agree with those who, like Näke, feel that

[19] The character of the trimeter,—10.1 resolutions per hundred lines in our section *vs.* 8.7 in the rest of the play,—furnishes no evidence.

[20] The markedly democratic setting of the action would not prove that Æschylus, although an aristocrat, was not the author, nor be a sure sign of late or "Euripidean" influence. The herald would not call for a third actor as Ismene's part would probably be taken by an extra singer (Christ, 223; Haigh, *Att. Theatre,* ed. 1907, 234–7). The theory of Wilamowitz (*op. cit.*) that Æschylus, intending to represent the *total* extinction of the Labdacidæ, made no mention whatever of the sisters, is ingenious but questionable. Corssen's argument (p. 32–3) from vv. 1049 and 1076, 1053–55 for a post-Æschylean date, is no more convincing than Wundt's (p. 380) from the same data, for the year 467, when the excitement resulting from the Persian wars still led to vacillation and frequent injustice on the part of the Demos.

[21] See Corssen, 28–31.

no sequel is implied, that the audience departs satisfied as to the ultimate success and safety of Antigone: the lack of clearness and definiteness as to the outcome certainly seem undeniable. At any rate, the smoothness and "regularity" of the action has suddenly been broken in a way which one would hardly expect in Æschylus. The passage seems, then, to be the work of some poet of inferior dramatic ability who was, however, clever at imitating the externals of Æschylus' style,—probably one who was inspired by the Antigone, yet aimed at a degree of independence.[22]

While therefore some other post-epic writers may have treated this phase of the story before the Antigone was written, there is a very strong probability that Sophocles was the first to bring it within the pale of Greek literature,[23] or at least, the first to give it a worthy form, and to make part of it, the great moral question that has ever since been associated with it.[24]

---

[22] Wundt, arguing for the soundness of the passage, points out many details in which it differs from the Antigone,—as the heroine's attitude toward the deed she is doing (Sept. 1038–9 *vs., e. g.,* Ant. 559–60; Sept. 1034 *vs.* Ant. 74), her impelling motive (consanguinity in the Sept. *vs.* this, and also love and deep religious feeling in the Ant.), the far greater definiteness of the outcome in the latter play; Wundt then asks how a redactor, writing after 440, could have failed to follow Sophocles in these points. His argument is strong, yet he fails to account for the break in the action. F. Dümmler (*Philol.* 7 (N. F.). 211, n. 10) thinks that the Todtenklage and the entire ending may be by Euphorion; see Suidas s. v. Euphorion, and also Quintilian (Inst. Or., 10. 1. 66), "tragoedias primus in lucem Aeschylus protulit, sublimis et grandiloquens saepe usque ad vitium, sed rudis in plerisque et incompositus. Propter quod *correctas eius fabulas in certamen deferre posterioribus poetis* Athenienses permiserunt, suntque eo modo multi coronati." Corssen (pp. 33–5) calls the passage post-Euripidean.

[23] See p. 27, n. 1; p. 29, n. 11.

[24] Possibly here (or in the story of Hypermestra in the Ægyptíi of Æschylus), we see the first trace in European literature of the motif of "love *vs.* duty." See also Wecklein in *Sitzb. d. bay. Akad.* (ph.-ph. Cl.), 1878, p. 191 (186 ff.).

EXCURSUS C.

The Originality of the Plot of the Ajax (p. 18).

Concerning this question there is considerable doubt. The first reference to the dead hero,—Od. 11. 543 ff.,—seems to imply his suicide through disappointment over the award of the arms, but the context expresses the universal regret of the Achæans for the hero's death. The Æthiopis of Arctinus apparently told much the same story.[1] The Little Iliad is the first to add the account of the frenzied onslaught on the cattle, and of the hero's dishonoring after death, by being not cremated but interred in a coffin, through the anger of the king.[2] Which of these sources, if either, did Æschylus follow in his Thressæ? Did he there represent Ajax as dishonored after death? It seems certain that he introduced a debate between the rival heroes (fr. 175) which probably was before Trojan prisoners or the Greek generals as judges; for, as Jebb points out,[3] a tragedian would hardly have used the motif of the gossiping Trojan maidens, as in the Little Iliad.[4] Æschylus, therefore, may well have followed Arctinus in the matter of the hero's burial also.[5] The chief

[1] Schol. Il. 11. 515; Eust. 1698. 49; Christ on Pind. I. 3(4). 54 (ed. 1896).

[2] Eust., p. 285. 34; see Philostr. Her., 315 (Kayser).

[3] *Ajax*, p. xix ff..

[4] Schol. Ar. Eq., 1056 (Dübner).

[5] So Bergk 3. 377. Jebb argues (1. 1.) that the writers under the later Empire (as Quint. Smyrn.), who all make the judges Trojan prisoners, are in this probably following Æschylus rather than the little-known Æthiopis (which is first cited only in Dionys. Hal.) or even Homer. J. Schmidt (*Ulixes Posthomericus*, in *Berlin. Studd.*, 1885, 446–51) argues that in the Thressæ Odysseus plays the part of a peacemaker between Teucer and the Atridæ (the implication being that there was an attempt to dishonor Ajax's corpse), partly because Æschylus seems

objection to this is the fact that Aristotle (Poet. 1459 b) mentions the "Award of the Arms" as one of the "more than eight" (tragedies) that are made out of the Little Iliad; but Aristotle may mean topics rather than individual plays, for no authors are mentioned, and some subjects, *e. g.*, the Arm. Iud. itself, form only episodes in other plays.[6] Though certainty is impossible, it is more probable that Æschylus said nothing of any ill treatment of the hero. Since we have no other mention of this phase of the story in any extant literature prior to the last third of the fifth century except in Pindar, who seems to follow Arctinus,[7] there is a considerable degree of likelihood that Sophocles, following the Little Iliad, was the first post-epic writer to mention the attempted dishonoring of Ajax's corpse.

to give him uniformly a generous nature, *e. g.*, as peacemaker in the Telephus, also, chiefly because of frr. 14 and 15 of the Arm. Iud. of Accius (O. Ribbeck, *Die röm. Trag. im Zeitalt. d. Rep.*, 373–4), where some such scene is probably represented. But Accius seems to be using rather the Sophoclean Ajax as one of his sources at least; note the following parallels: fr. 10 "virtuti sis par," etc. = Ai. 550; fr. 4 (Ajax a tower of defence) = Ai. 1211–3, 1273 ff. et al.; fr. 12 (A.'s stubborn spirit) = Ai. 766; fr. 13 (the gods' help needful) = Ai. 758 ff. et al.. Yet the possibility of contamination would itself vitiate any conclusions as to details.

[6] Possibly, *e. g.*, in the Ajax of Theodectes, Ar. Rhet., 1400 a.

[7] N. 8. 23 ff., 7. 24 ff., I. 3. 53 ff..

EXCURSUS D

The Question of Burial Rights in Known Fifth Century Plays (p. 20).

These include beside the Ajax and the Antigone, the Eleusinii and the Phryges of Æschylus and *possibly* the Thressæ; the Septem; the Euripidean Supplices and Phœnissæ. The *Eleusinii*[1] seems to have told of the recovery and burial of the corpses of the "Seven" by Adrastus and Theseus (Plut. Thes. 29). Hauvette dates the play 475–70, and assigns to the "eloquent" Adrastus a funeral oration, criticised and "corrected" (p. 175) by Euripides in the Supplices 857 ff.. But there must also have been speeches by the two leaders at Thebes asking the surrender of the dead, for Plutarch says that the Thebans gave them up, "having been persuaded." Possibly Priam's arguments in Il. 24. 486 ff. may show the general feeling on these matters of the Thebais, which Æschylus in his turn may have followed,—pity for the suppliant's wretchedness, the appeal to love for kindred, the gods' hatred of the merciless. Yet Æschylus may have brought out the idea of divine vengeance upon wanton outrage, as in his *Phryges* (*Ransom of Hector*) fr. 266,—"it recks not to the joy or sorrow of the dead if thou show them kindness or work them ill; *but* our *Nemesis still hath power,*[2] *and the vengeance of him who is dead worketh her wrath.*" This suggestion of avenging spirits,—hardly chthonian deities seeking their due,—can be compared with Hector's words, Il. 22. 358 ff., "lest I become a vengeance of the gods upon thee in that day when thou shalt be

[1] See Hauvette, *Mél. Weil*, 159 ff.; also Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 26. 227, n. 1.

[2] I query ἡμῖν for ἡμῶν; ὑπερτέρα = "is mightier."

slain." Of the *Thressæ* the only usable fragment, 83 (so possibly 84 also), merely describes Ajax's death. The *Septem* offers a striking contrast to the Antigone and in part to the Ajax. Antigone does not defend the character of Polynices as such; she urges provocation (1054) as his sole and adequate excuse. She cites the gods not as impelling her, but simply as corroborating her opinion and plan (1052).[3] It is also only the Gods of the Fatherland,—chthonian deities strictly localized and not universal,—who are interested.[4] In the *Supplices* of Euripides, pity and national pride (163–92), the outraged rights of the gods, "reverence, piety, justice" (559, 564–5), are the chief motives appealed to. Note also 511–12, "Zeus hath wrought sufficiency who took vengeance on them (the chieftains) but we ought not to work such violence." Characteristic of later times are also the references to Hellenic law (*e. g.*, 311). The notion that exposure of enemies is false cowardice (540–8) seems rather curious; and Nauck may be right in bracketing 531–6, "after death the law is, 'spirit to air, dust to earth.'" The *Phœnissæ* adds practically nothing.[5]

A brief survey of this question in Homer and the tragedians shows two mutually counteracting ideas,—the tendency to hatred expressing itself in outrage to an enemy's corpse, and the growing belief in spirits which punished such wantonness. As they develop through Homer, Æschylus, and Sophocles, they reach the point where the feeling is voiced that it is morally wrong to indulge such hatred and vengefulness, for the Nether Gods,—not merely local deities,[6] —demand the privilege of burial for all, and will surely

[3] I read ἤδη (or ἦ δή· Casaubon) τὰ τοῦδ' οὐ διατετίμηται θεοῖς, "have made no distinction."

[4] Wundt, *Philol.*, 1906, 373–6.

[5] On Phœn. 1653 see the ed. of Bernardakis.

[6] This is one of Wundt's arguments for the priority of the end of the Septem to the Antigone, but it does not prove its genuineness, and its author may be of the "Euripidean school" so to say.

punish wanton outrage.[7] Euripides seems to utter these various views at random, adding certain later sophistic speculations (*e. g.,* Suppl. 540–8), but the problem, not being directly human and ethical, appears not particularly to appeal to him except as one phase of the general civilizing and uplifting tendency for which Athens stood.

[7] A similar progression along other lines is sketched by Æschylus in his Orestia.

EXCURSUS E

The Date of the Antigone (p. 21).

Relatively reliable but hardly specific enough is the evidence of the meter.

(*a*) The proportion of resolutions in the trimeter, 3.7, is smaller than in any other Sophoclean play extant except the Electra with 2.9.

(*b*) As in Æschylus, so here, antilabé never occurs; but it is found in other plays of Sophocles.

(*c*) An anapest nowhere occurs in the first foot of the trimeter in the Antigone, but is fairly frequent in the other plays, notably in the Philoctetes.[1]

(*d*) Five times the entrance of speakers is announced in anapestic stanzas, a device occurring rarely elsewhere in Sophocles.[2] The Antigone is thus among the oldest, if not the oldest, of the Sophoclean plays.[3]

More definite but less trustworthy is the statement of the second argument to the Antigone that the play "was reckoned the thirty-second." Yet whether this means that the Antigone is the fourth play of the eighth tetralogy, or the second of the eleventh trilogy,[4] or one of the thirty-second

[1] The figures given by Van Leeuwen (p. 23) are, El. one case, Ai. 2, O. C. 3, Tr. 6, O. T. 9, Phil. 17. The greater laxity in these matters of the Ajax as a whole does not affect our problem; see p. 21.

[2] An anapestic stanza is closely connected with a following commatic passage in O. T. 1297 ff. and Tr. 974 ff.; and in Phil. 1409 is used by Heracles to announce his entrance, but is followed immediately by trimeters. The anapestic dialogue of Ant. 929 ff. cannot be paralleled in Sophocles except in Ai. 201 ff., but the latter becomes lyrico-anapestic, somewhat like Phil. 144 ff.; cp. the parodos of the Antigone, 100 ff.; see also Med. 96 ff. and Hippol. 176 ff..

[3] See also p. 48, n. 37.

[4] Jebb, *Ant.* xlviii ff..

trilogic (or tetralogic) group,[5] can not be determined.[6] In any event, even if correct, it cannot give us a certain date[7] (—Professor Earle's reckoning makes 436 the earliest possible), for Sophocles may not have competed every year since he began his career in 468.

More specific evidence is furnished by the tradition reported in the first argument to the Antigone, that, as a result of his success with this tragedy, the poet was elected general for the Samian expedition of 441–40 B. C.[8] Although this story cannot be proven true and is also capable of several interpretations, it seems to contain a large element of truth, and will repay closer investigation.

Thucydides says that the Samian war began in the sixth year of the Thirty Years' Peace (1. 115–17). The peace was sworn 01. 83. 3 (Diod. Sic. 12. 7; see Paus, 5. 23. 3), *i. e.*, 446–5, more specifically, in the late fall or early winter of 446.[9] The sixth year would be from about November, 441, to October, 440, though it is equally possible that the civil year, July, 441–June, 440, was thought of; Diodorus assigns the Samian war to the archonship of Timocles Ol. 84. 4 = 441–440, July to June. In this year the war between Samos and Miletus over Priene began, and the whole affair, through the final subjection of Samos to Athens, ended in the civil year under Morychides (Schol. Ar. Vesp. 283 [ed. Dübner, 1843, p. 142]). The events, then, lie

[5] Prof. Earle's *Alcestis*, xxviii–ix, 4–5.

[6] For Bergk's view see 3. 414, n. 161; also below, p. 48.

[7] See A. Gudeman, *Grundr. z. Gesch. d. Kl. Philologie*, 1907, p. 33, n. 1.

[8] See Vit. Soph. 5; Suidas s. v. Melissus; Strabo 14. 1. 18; Plut. Pericl. 25–28 (see R. Rau, *Quæstt. Plutt.* [diss.]; Lipsiæ, 1901, p. 25 and ff.); Schol. Ar. Pac. 698; Androtion, Atthis (Müller, *F. H. G.* 4. 645). For a discussion see Süvern, *Ueber einige hist. u. polit. Anspiel. in d. alt. Trag.* (in *Abhdg. d. hist.-phil. Classe d. kg. Akad. zu Berlin* aus dem Jahre 1824, p. 14 ff.); Wilamowitz, *Aristot. u. Athen.*, 2(3), 298, n. 14; Christ, *Litt.-gesch.*, par. 162, n. 9; Bergk, 3. 363, nn. 22 and 23; especially Jebb, *Ant.* xlii–xlviii; also p. 40, n. 10 (below).

[9] See Thucydides' story of this year in 1. 114–115. 1.

between November or July, 441, and June, 439, inclusive.[10]

The main occurrences may be outlined as follows:

1. The first expedition of the Athenians on the complaint of the Milesians and certain Samian revolutionaries, to establish a democracy in Samos: occupying "a few days" (Diod. Sic. 12. 27. 2).

2. Samian oligarchs immediately negotiate with Pissuthnes of Sardis, operate in Samos and Lesbos, and *revolt* from Athens, along with Byzantium.

3. Pericles sails with a fleet in three divisions (one to Chios and Lesbos for reënforcements, one to meet an approaching Phœnician fleet, one against the Samian fleet), and defeats the Samians at *Tragia.*

4. Pericles, the reënforcements from the islands and also from Athens having arrived, *invests Samos* with the fleet and with a triple wall.

5. Pericles sails against the Phœnician fleet: "meanwhile" the Samians *break the blockade,* and control the neighboring sea for about two weeks.

6. Pericles returns and *renews the blockade.*

7. *Fresh reënforcements* arrive from Athens and the islands.

8. Samos is stormed and *surrenders* "in the ninth month" (Thuc. 1. 117. 3; Plut. Pericl. 28).

Considering the power and importance of Samos, Pericles' sailing (3) must have followed the revolt (2) at the earliest possible moment. It seems probable that between Tragia (3) and the second investment (6) four or five weeks elapsed; for after the battle hardly less than one week or ten days can have passed before the arrival of the first reënforcements from Athens (4); probably Pericles, though victorious, had found the enemy so strong that he dared not prosecute the

[10] See Böckh, *des Soph. Ant.*, pp. 102–123; Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, 3. 1. 422, n. 1, 436, 542 ff.; Curtius 2. 472 (Engl. ed. 1868–70); Duncker (ed. 1888), 5. 191–211.

attack without further help;[11] the investing of the city with a triple wall (4) may have consumed a week, possibly less; Pericles' return (6) after the outbreak of the Samians (5) is placed by Thucydides two weeks farther on. As to the other intervals we have no basis for conjecture, except that from the elaborateness of the siege operations,[12] considerable time seems to have passed between the renewal of the blockade (6), or the arrival of fresh forces (7), and the surrender (8). This occurred "in the ninth month," which period may be reckoned *possibly* from the revolt (2), perhaps from Tragia (3), or from the renewal of the blockade (6); most likely, however, *from the first investment* (4).[13]

If Sophocles held a strategia in this war, he can have sailed either with the original expedition (3), or with the first reënforcements from Athens (4), or with the second from Athens (7). That he went with the original expedition (3) seems fairly certain from the account by Ion of Chios (in Athen. 603 E) of his meeting with Sophocles at Chios, where he says that the tragedian was sailing as strategus to Lesbos. Sophocles' only other military service of which we hear was under Nicias,[14] and if the opinion of Pericles and Ion[15] can be trusted that he was not much of a

[11] The message which announced the victory doubtless summoned reënforcements. Plut. (Pericl. 25–6) says that Pericles won a "brilliant" victory, and pursuing the enemy to Samos at once gained control of the harbor and began the siege; then *when "a larger force" arrived from Athens, Samos was entirely shut in.* On the great strength of Samos at this time see Duncker, p. 191 ff. (also Plut. Pericl. 28).

[12] Ephorus in Plut. Pericl. 27; Diod. 12. 28. 2–3; with these Thuc. (117. 2–3) is not in conflict, although he seems to imply a very short time.

[13] Thucydides in 117. 3,—*ἐξεπολιορκήθησαν ἐνάτι μηνί*,—seems to be thinking of the siege, and probably ignores the breaking of the blockade as being only temporary, for the renewing he describes thus (117. 1), *ταῖς νανσὶ κατεκλήσθησαν*; of the original investment he says (116. 2) *ἐπολιόρκουν.*

[14] Plut. Nic. 15, where Sophocles deferred to Nicias in the words, "*I am the elder but you are the senior.*" Plut. appears to place this (erroneously) during the Sicilian expedition. His service as Hellenotamias in 443–2 (*C. I. A.* 1. 237) is not to be considered here.

[15] In Athen. 604 D; so too Sophocles himself in Plutarch just cited.

military man, it may be possible to limit such activities of his to these two occasions. Probably, then, Sophocles sailed with that division of the first expedition which went to summon reënforcements from the islands, so that he reached Samos with the allied fleet a week or ten days after Tragia, about the time when the first reënforcements arrived (4) and the investment of the town began. He could hardly have come with the last Athenian fleet (7) for the commanders of the two squadrons composing it are distinctly enumerated by Thucydides (117. 2).

Sophocles thus left Athens shortly[16] before the first investment of Samos, four or five weeks before the renewal of the blockade. Now the earliest possible date for his sailing is the end of August, 441, which is four or five weeks before the beginning of October, 441, which latter date, if the nine months are reckoned to the *second investment,* is the ninth month before the accession of Morychides in July, 440, under whom Samos surrendered.[17] The latest possible date is the end of June, 440, as the war at least broke out during Timo-

[16] Possibly ten days or a week, or even less.

[17] Diodorus definitely includes all the Samian war under Timocles (July 441–June 440) and none under Morychides. But probably he misunderstood or ignored his sources (Ephorus and others), and placed everything in the one archonship because of the shortness of the war. It is worth remarking that Diodorus names as the Roman Consuls corresponding to Timocles, Lars Herminius and T. Stertinius Structo. The colleague of L. H. in the Fasti as published in *C. I. L.* 1. 1, p. 494, is T. Verginius Tricostus, and their year, a. u. c. 306 = B. C. 448 (the year beginning December 13 according to Mommsen; see *Hermes* 5. 380 ff.). Matzat, however (*Röm. Chron.* 2. 44), joins Herminius and Stertinius under a. u. c. 306 of the *Varronine* system = 442–1 B. C. (the date of their accession being placed November 7). If Matzat is correct we might infer that D. associated the Samian war with 441 B. C., that is, with the second half of Timocles' archonship, and hence that the whole affair fell within his term, *i. e.,* ended before July 440 at the latest. It might have been otherwise had he associated Timocles with the consuls of the *following* year. Thus his statement with Matzat's chronology might constitute an argument against the restoration in the *C. I. A.* (see below); but such an inference is hardly warranted.

cles' archonship, which ended the last of this month;[18] hence the war must have ended not later than the ninth month after this date,—not later than February, 439.

Hence, if the Antigone was the *immediate* cause of his election, it dates April 1, 440, or earlier. Can we fix the time more closely?

According to Köhler's[19] and Kirchhoff's restoration of the Attic tribute-lists for April, 440 (*C. I. A.* 1. 239), the Byzantians, who revolted with the Samians, paid their quota that year (440). No name remains on the stone at this point owing to a mutilation of the surface, though the letters indicating the amount of money paid, by whatever state it was, still survive opposite the break. If the restoration is correct, the Samain revolt could hardly have preceded the Greater Dionysia[20] of 440. The sailing of Pericles and Sophocles, and the battle of Tragia with the beginning of the siege will thus fall between the beginning or middle of April and the end of June, 440. A date early in the year is indicated by Ion's story already cited; he says that "standing *by the fire* was the youthful wine-pourer" whose beauty Sophocles noticed. This casual phrase suggests a fire for warmth,—not for light, for under the circumstances this must have been furnished by lamps or torches; much less for cooking, for we have here described the symposium of a rather pretentious banquet: for Hermesilaus, a "guest-friend" of Sophocles and also the official Chian proxenus of Athens, is entertaining the great poet-general on business of the Empire bent, and among the guests is the world-renowned Ion. The incident must then have occurred in the spring while the evenings were still chilly. Probably then Sophocles sailed early in

[18] Of course if Sophocles sailed with the second reënforcements (6), he might have left as late as June 1, 439.

[19] *Delisch-Attischer Bund*, p. 37 (in *Abh. d. kg. Akad. zu Berlin*, 1869).

[20] At which festival the tribute was paid; Acharn. 502 ff. (with Schol.); Eupolis fr. 240 Kock; Schol. Acharn. 378; *C. I. A.* 1. 38. c. d.

April,[21] perhaps using the special squadron of sixty triremes which was annually fitted out for general summer cruising[22] and which may have been ready by this time (—Thucydides in 116 mentions sixty as the number of ships in Pericles' fleet).

But the name "Byzantians" may be incorrectly supplied in *C. I. A.* 1. 239. Neither Kirchhoff nor Köhler gives any note on the emendation, nor can I find light from any of the editors cited by them (—Eph. 1222–1223 is not available), nor anywhere else.[23] The order of the names on the stone and the amounts contributed vary from year to year. If the correction is to be rejected, Sophocles may have sailed in the fall of 441, and *probably rather late,* chiefly on the evidence of Ion,[24] also because the naming of the generals who led the reënforcements may imply that they were the newly elected officials, who would then have been chosen February–March, 440.[25] Of course, Curtius' view that the revolt occurred during the winter and that Sophocles sailed about March 1, 440, before the normal opening of the season, is entirely possible.

Thus Sophocles may have sailed:

i. early in April, 440, after the Greater Dionysia (the inscription being correctly restored);

ii. March 1, 440, before the Dionysia (Curtius);

[21] The establishment of the democracy in Samos would then be in the late fall of 441 with the Prienean war just preceding, the events thus coming within the sixth year of Thucydides, beginning October–November, 441 (see p. 39).

[22] Duncker, p. 139; with his view in general mine chances to coincide. To Jebb (*Ant.*, Introd.) I owe the suggestion concerning the fire.

[23] In Pauly-Wissowa, 3. 1131. 20–21 (s. v. *Byzantion*) the restoration is accepted without discussion; see context following passage cited.

[24] See on p. 43; this is also Thucydides' "sixth year" (p. 39).

[25] As to the months, see below. One of the two squadrons named may have been sent direct to Samos, the other by way of the Islands to summon the aid which arrived from Chios and Lesbos (with which Sophocles *may* have sailed; see above, p. 43, n. 18). Yet Thuc.'s words also suggest the concentration of several squadrons already on service.

iii. in the fall of 441 (the inscription being incorrectly restored). When was he elected?

Aristotle's Constitution of Athens, 44. 4 says that the regular election of strategi at Athens was in the seventh prytany, as early as the weather was propitious;[26] that is, from about the middle of March to the middle of February. Furthermore, Sophocles seems to have been chosen at the regular and not at a special election. For Thucydides in 116. 2 speaks of "Pericles *himself the tenth* being in command," and Androtion (l. l.) mentions all ten generals by name, in the order (probably[27]) of their tribal precedence.

Hence Sophocles was probably elected:

(a) *February–March, 440* (sailing early in April: Samos then surrendered December, 440, the generals of Thuc. 116. 2 being specially elected during the summer);

(b) (sailing March 1, 440) *either February, 440, or February–March, 441,* according to the precise date of the elections of 440 (the surrender being November, 440);

(c) (sailing in the fall of 441) *February–March, 441* (the town capitulating July, 440, and the final reënforcements being perhaps led by the regular generals for 440).

If chosen at a *special* election, it would be:

(*a*) *beginning of April, 440, after the Dionysia;*

(*b*) *during the winter, 441–40;*

(*c*) *in the fall of 441.*

In any case, Sophocles' election seems to have preceded the Greater Dionysia of 440, except on the hypothesis that he was specially chosen just after the festival (*a*).

We must now examine the two assumptions that have been involved in the foregoing discussion, that Sophocles held a strategia during this war, and that the Antigone was influential in securing his election to that office. The former tradi-

[26] The elections being in the Pnyx (Poll. 8. 133), superstition also playing some part (Acharn. 171). See Kenyon's and Sandys' edd. of Aristotle ad loc..

[27] See Jebb's interesting note on this, *Ant.* xliv, n. 2.

tion has considerable support in the testimony of Androtion, who was a pupil of Isocrates,[28] that Sophocles was one of the ten generals in the Samian war (see above, p. 45). The fact that he had no military ability is of course no argument against this. On the other hand, he was apparently well qualified to serve on embassies, for his culture, tact, and cheerful geniality could doubtless accomplish very much, especially with allies whose good will toward Athens was an uncertain quantity.[29] We may then accept the story as substantially true.[30]

As to the relation of the Antigone to the poet's election, positive evidence is lacking. Many consider the story pure fiction.[31] As it stands it does not square easily with the dates obtained; and since the election *preceded* the Dionysia by at least two weeks, nearly a year must have elapsed between Sophocles' winning of popularity with his play, and its final reward,—rather too much to expect of the grateful remembrance of a democracy. Yet the story is not in itself impossible. The principles of business-like caution and of good government voiced by Creon in his first speech, and especially the democratic views of Hæmon would appeal to the audience generally, while the more thoughtful would also be struck by the lofty moral and religious tone pervading the play, and by the philosophical speculations and analyses of the second stasimon.[32] It is also conceivable that in the year of Sophocles' election, an exceptional spell of bad weather put off this assembly until after the Dionysia; or

[28] Christ, p. 574; Wilamowitz, *Aristot. u. Athen*, 1. 287–8.

[29] Curtius, 2. 472. Pericles' good judgment would be seen in sending him to the islands. Note further that Ion (consistently with the other evidence) implies that Pericles was not present at the banquet.

[30] So Bergk, 3. 414; Christ, 236, n. 3; Croiset, 3. 236.

[31] Sittl, *Gr. Lit.*, 3. 287; Schneid.-Nauck's ed. of Ant., 1880, p. 29; also Sandys, 1. 1..

[32] With which compare fr. 1 of the Sisyphus of Critias (Nauck, p. 771) (also fr. 6 of Moschion); and see the story of Phrynichus in Ælian, Var. Hist., 3. 8.

the date in the 84th Olympiad may have been later than in 329 (or 325) when Aristotle wrote his treatise.[33] If, however, we assume a special election in April, 440, the tradition will be far easier to explain.

On the whole I think we are fully warranted in concluding that this story has a certain foundation of truth, and owes its origin to the fact that the Antigone, an unusually successful play,[34] was *relatively contemporaneous with* Sophocles' service as strategus in the Samian war, to which office he was elected because of his general popularity,[35] even if not directly because of his success with the Antigone.

The play then belongs to the end of the 84th or the beginning of the 85th Olympiad. This period, however, can be somewhat narrowed. April, 439, seems impossible, as it is so long after the retirement of Timocles in June, 440. A date later than 439 seems further precluded by the fact that the Euripidean trilogy of 438 appears to show reminiscences of the Antigone.[36] On the other hand the years 444–42,

[33] See Sandys ad loc., also p. xxxix ff.. Aristotle seems to limit the possible period of the election to the seventh prytany.

[34] To the above-cited authorities add Dioscurides in Anth. Pal., 7. 37. 9–10.

[35] Note his appointment as Hellenotamias only two years before, 443–2.

[36] *Connection* of the Antigone with the Euripidean trilogy of 438 may be indicated by the following:

(*a*) Alc. 648–9 = Ant. 72, 96–7, 502–4 (the glory of vicarious danger and death); the similarity of motif in the plays is noteworthy; see below, (*e*), (1) and (2); also Alc. 291–2.

(*b*) Cressæ fr. 465 = Ant. 575 ("Hades will settle this question for me").

(*c*) Alcm. fr. 86 = Ant. 469 f. ("foolishness gaineth one the charge of folly"); cp. Alc. 1093.

(*d*) Alc. 383 = Ant. 547 ("'tis enough that I die"); note verbal similarities in the context, Alc. 380 (382) = Ant. 548 ("I cannot live without thee").

[(*e*) Alcm. fr. 84 = Ant. 641–5 (children a defence to their parents).]

Priority to the Antigone may be indicated by—

(1) Alc. 897–901 = Ant. 73 (to lie beside one's dead in death); the (semi-lyric) verbosity of Admetus marks well the selfish man now conscience-stricken and elaborately repentant; yet the striking verbal

although possible, are too far before the archonship of Timocles to be likely.[37] The year 441 can also be eliminated with considerable confidence, for to that year the Parian Chronicle assigns the first tragic victory of Euripides.[38] Bergk's theory that the Antigone won the second prize on this occasion is suggestive but far from convincing[39] (even though the Œdipus Tyrannus itself was defeated by Philocles[40]), especially in view of the very great popularity of the Antigone.

similarity of the passages with the greater simplicity of the Sophoclean may mark the former as reminiscent of the latter.

(2) Alc. 83–5, 150–156, 899 = Ant. 693–9 (cp. 504–5) ("she hath done a glorious deed and is the best among women as all the town owneth"); Euripides' words may be the later, because they are more rhetorical in tone, and verse 156 seems to be an intentional echo of Ant. 693–9, as it is less essential to the context. Prof. Earle (*Alcestis*, xxviii–ix, 4–5) draws an opposite conclusion from these passages. See above, p. 9, n. 20.

[37] Wilamowitz (*Aristot. u. Athen.*, 2. 298, n. 14) suggests that 443 may also be excepted, since the poet's duties as Hellenotamias would prevent him from bringing out a trilogy that year. Schöll (*Soph. Leben u. Wirken*, 133–62) mentions many events of the 84th Ol. to which the Antigone may refer; *e. g.*, the founding of Thurii in 444 (Ant. 1119; but here for "Italia" Unger reads "Icaria": all other references in the ode are to regions about Bœotia, except to Eleusis and "Nysa"); the policy of Pericles (see Duncker, l. l., also Earle's *O. T.* above cited). Ant. 905 ff. seems to repeat Hdt. 3. 11; if so it would be later than 445. A comparison of Chrysothemis and Electra with Ismene and Antigone, and of the parts they play in the two tragedies will establish the likelihood of the priority of the Antigone; note also sundry parallel passages, *e. g.*, Ant. 773–4, 777–8, 885–8 (955–62) = El. 379–82; Ant. 419–21 = El. 713–15, 729–30. This inference is consistent with the conclusions of the majority of modern scholars that the Electra is one of Sophocles' later plays; but the great divergence of opinion as to the exact time of its composition make it impossible to establish from the Electra any definite date for the Antigone. See Jebb's *Electra*, liv ff.; Christ, 250–1.

[38] *C. I. G.* 2. 2474, l. 75. The stone may not be correct in giving Euripides' age as forty-three at this time; but the wording of the Chronicle seems to show that its author, in dating the victory 441, was following certain old didascalia, if not the official stones themselves.

[39] 3. 414, n. 161.

[40] Arg. to O. T.; also Aristides on the Four (Statesmen), 256 (Dind.).

The most probable date is therefore April, 440, partly for the reasons already adduced, chiefly because no other Dionysia can well have fallen within the period covered by the war, which seems to have been at the outside from July or November, 441, to February, 439.[41]

[41] Wilamowitz suggestively remarks (*Kultur d. Gegenwart*, I.8, p. 48), "die Antigone ist mit der frischen Lebenserfahrung eines Staatssekretärs des Reichsschatzamtes (443–2) geschrieben."

LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES CONSULTED.

[The titles of the chief standard works on literary and political history (as Bergk, Croiset, Busolt), grammar (as Brugmann, Kühner-Blass-Gerth), antiquities (Pauly-Wissowa, Gruppe), etc., have been omitted; also authorities consulted only in details.]

Behme, J. De lite sepulcrali in Sophoclis fabula quae vocatur Aiax (diss.). Marburgi, 1884.

Bergk, T. Sophoclis tragœdiæ. Lipsiæ, 1858.

Bethe, E. Thebanische Heldenlieder. Leipzig, 1891.

Böckh, A. Des Sophocles Antigone. Leipzig, 1884.

—— Græciæ tragoediæ principum, etc. Heidelberg, 1808.

Both, P. De Antiphontis et Thucydidis genere dicendi (diss.). Marburg, 1875.

Campbell, L. Tragic Drama in Æschylus, Sophocles and Shakespeare. New York and London, 1904.

Cook, A. B. Associated Reminiscence (in *Class. Rev.*, 15, 338 ff.). London, 1901.

—— Unconscious Iteration (*ib.*, 16, 146 ff., 256 ff.). London, 1902.

Corssen, P. Die Antigone des Sophokles. Berlin, 1898.

Denis, J. La comédie grecque. Paris, 1886.

Earle, M. L. The Œdipus Tyrannus of Sophocles. New York, 1901.

—— Euripides' Alcestis. London and New York, 1894.

Ebeling, H. Wörterbuch zu Sophokles. Leipzig, 1869.

Ellendt, F. T. Lexicon Sophocleum. Regimontii, 1835; Berlin, 1872.

Geffcken, J. Das griechische Drama. Leipzig u. Berlin, 1904.

Haigh, A. E. The Tragic Drama of the Greeks. Oxford, 1896.

Hauvette, A. Les "Eleusiniens" d'Eschyle et l'institution du discours funèbre à Athènes (in Mélanges Henri Weil, 159 ff.). Paris, 1898.

van Herwerden, H. Lexicon græcum supplementorium et dialecticum. Lugduni Batavorum, 1902. Appendix eiusd., 1904.

Jebb, R. C. Sophocles, Plays and Fragments. Cambridge, 1887–96.

—— Sophocles, the Text of the Seven Plays. Cambridge, 1897.

Klein, J. L. Geschichte des griechischen und römischen Drama's (in his Geschichte des Drama's 1–2). Leipzig, 1865.

Königsbeck, J. De Septem contra Thebas exitu (diss.). Danzig, 1891.

van Leeuwen, J. Commentatio de Aiacis Sophoclei authentia et integritate. Traiecti ad Rhenum, 1881.

Lobeck, C. A. Sophoclis Aiax. Berolini, 1866.

Mistriotis, G. Welches ist das älteste Drama des Sophocles? (in *Annales Internat. d'hist.*, sect. 6 *hist. comparée des litt.* 259 ff.). Paris, 1901.

Müller, C. F. De pedibus solutis in dialogorum senariis Æschyli Sophoclis Euripidis. Berolini, 1866.

Näke, A. F. Die Thebanische Tetralogie des Aeschylus (in *Rh. Mus.*, 27, 193 ff.). Frankfurt a. M., 1872.

Nauck, A. Euripidis Tragœdiæ. Lipsiæ, 1891–5.

—— Tragicæ dictionis index. Petropoli, 1892.

—— Tragicorum græcorum fragmenta. Lipsiæ, 1889.

Oberdick, J. De exitu fabulæ Æschyli quæ Septem contra Thebas inscribitur commentatio (Jahresb.). Arnsberg, 1877.

Osann, F. Ueber des Sophokles Aias. Berlin, 1820.

Papageorgiu, P. N. Scholia in Sophoclis tragœdias vetera. Lipsiæ, 1888.

Ribbeck, J. K. O. Sophokles und seine Tragödien. Berlin, 1869.

—— Ueber einige historische Dramen der Griechen (in *Rh. Mus.*, 30, 145 ff.). Frankfurt a. M., 1875.

Rohde, E. Psyche. Tübingen, 1907.

Schmidt, L. V. Die Ethik der alten Griechen. Berlin, 1882.

Schneidewin, F. W. Sophokles, ed. **A. Nauck.** Berlin, 1877–82.

Schöll, A. Sophokles, sein Leben und Wirken. Frankfurt a. M., 1842.

Schroeder, F. De iteratis apud tragicos græcos (diss.). Argentorati, 1882.

Sidgwick, A. Æschyli Tragœdiæ. Oxonii, 1902.

Süvern, J. W. Ueber einige historische und politische Anspielungen in der alten Tragödie (in *Abhdg. d. kg. Akad. zu Berlin, hist.-phil. Classe* aus dem Jahre 1824, 1 ff.). Berlin, 1824.

Verrall, A. W. On Literary Association and the Disregard of it in "Longinus" (in *Class. Rev.*, 19, 202 ff.). London, 1905.

Wecklein, N. Die kyklische Thebais, etc. (in *Sitzb. d. kg. bay. Akad. zu München*, 1901, 661 ff.). München, 1902.

Welcker, F. G. Der epische Cyclus. Bonn, 1865–82.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. Drei Schlussscenen griechischer Dramen (in *Sitzb. d. pr. Akad.*, 1903, 436 ff.). Berlin, 1903.

Wolff, G. Sophokles Aias. Leipzig, 1867.

Wolff, O. De Iophonte poeta tragica (diss.). Misniæ, 1884.

Wundt, M. Die Schlussscene der Sieben gegen Theben (in *Philol.* 65 = 19 N. F., 357 ff.). Leipzig, 1906.

LIFE.

The writer was born in New York City, February 26, 1877. After having attended public and private schools in New York City, he studied at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., for the academic year 1895–1896, and at Columbia College, 1896–1900, where he received the degree of A.B. in June, 1900. He was a student in Columbia University under the Faculty of Philosophy, 1900–1905, 1907 to date, holding the Drisler Fellowship in Classical Philology, 1902–1903. For the year 1905–1907 he was Lecturer in Classical Philology in Barnard College.

He desires to express his deep gratitude to those members of the Division of Classical Philology in Columbia University under whom he has studied and taught, to wit, Professors Knapp, Young, McCrea, Egbert, Wheeler, Perry, and Peck, for their unfailing kindliness and friendly interest and for the help and encouragement which he has constantly received from them in his work. In the death of Professor Earle, under whom a large part of his graduate work was done, and with whose advice and encouragement this present investigation was undertaken, he has suffered a personal loss which will long be keenly felt.